By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., urging an amendment to the naval bill to provide for the building of three instead of one vessel at a navyyard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of C. A. Stanton's Sons, in favor

of amendments to the bankruptcy act-to the Committee on the

By Mr. GORDON: Statement to accompany House bill 14321, granting a pension to Mrs. Harriet Fisk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions of the Germania Society of Freeport, Ill., favoring an expression of sympathy with the people of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Resolutions of Local Union No. 418, of

Jasonville, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULL: Resolutions of Mine Workers' Union No. 1761 of Madrid, Iowa, favoring an educational qualification for immi-

grants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Petitions of T. Q. Donaldson and 37 other lawyers of Greenville; R. T. Jaynes and 6 other lawyers of Oconee County; C. E. Robinson and 6 others of Pickens, State of South Carolina, for the passage of House bill 14202—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOY: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Charles Etzell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of Willoughby L. Wilson, administrator de bonis non of Willoughby Wilson, deceased, with itemized account and certificate of administration, in relation to

claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to William H. McHenry—to the Committee on Invalid

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Franklin Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. NAPHEN: Remonstrance of Massachusetts State Board

of Trade against the admission of Territories—to the Committee on the Territories

By Mr. NEVILLE: Resolutions of the Nebraska Real Estate Dealers' Association, protesting against leasing public lands to individuals and private corporations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of members of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Middletown, Ohio, favoring the passage of House

bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, resolutions of Columbus, Ohio, Credit Men's Association in regard to the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the League of German-American Societies,

of Dayton, Ohio, advocating the adoption of a resolution of sympathy for the Boers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Shelbyville, Tenn., to accompany House bill 2693, in behalf of Jordan H. Moore, asking to be restored to the pension roll—to the Committee on Military Affairs

the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Hiram A. Hober-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13958, granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Pemberton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Peter Coyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce of New York City, protesting against the passage of certain sections of House bill 12250—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolutions of the Iron Trades Council of San Francisco. Cal., urging Congress to provide for at least three war ships to be built in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 137, favoring an amendment to sundry civil bill increasing the appropriation for Geological Survey

to \$200,000—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution adopted by the Sons of Temperance of Connecticut, favoring the establishment of post exchanges at our military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., for the construction of war ships in the United

States navy-yards-to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of common council of Kenesha, Wis., urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. SELBY: Resolutions of Mine Workers' Unions Nos. 755, of Staunton, and 300, of Nilwood, Ill., for more rigid restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization

Naturalization.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Resolutions of Veteran Post, No. 42, of Denver, Colo., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union No. 49, of Denver, Colo., in memory of the death of the late Hon. Amos J. Cummings—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentrakyr, Positive of Lawrence H. Roys.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Petition of Lawrence H. Rousseau, for reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Com-

mittee on War Claims.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Resolutions of the town council of South Haven, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of El Paso, in favor of House bills 178 ann 179, for the repeal of the tax

on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Papers to accompany House bill to amend the military record of William A. Emerson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 13, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. Cullom, and by unanimous

consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Jour-

nal will stand approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. Mahon, Mr. Gisson, and Mr. Sims managers at the conference on the part of the House, with instructions not to agree to what are known as the Selfridge Board findings in the Senate amendments.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and they

were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 182) granting a pension to Mary F. Zollinger;

A bill (S. 288) granting an increase of pension to De Witt C. Bennett:

A bill (S. 500) granting a pension to Samuel S. Beaver; A bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Mrs. Aribella D. Meeker; A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Eben C.

Winslow

A bill (S. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Etta Adair Anderson;

A bill (S. 2336) granting a pension to Rebecca Coppinger; A bill (S. 2347) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Wheeler

A bill (S. 2461) granting an increase of pension to George Mc-Dowell;

A bill (S. 2632) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to the Clearwater Valley Railroad Company a right of way through the Nez Perces Indian land in Idaho;

A bill (S. 2755) granting a pension to Ruth H. Ferguson;

A bill (S. 3279) granting a pension to John Coolen;

A bill (S. 3331) granting a pension to Ada V. Park;

A bill (S. 3439) to amend an act entitled "An act to license

billiard and pool tables in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;"
A bill (S. 3999) granting an increase of pension to Emma S.

A bill (S. 4004) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Nelson;

A bill (S. 4238) granting an increase of pension to Philo F. Englesby

A bill (S. 4256) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Edens;

A bill (S. 4293) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Vincent

A bill (S. 4455) granting an increase of pension to Hallowell Goddard:

A bill (S. 4506) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Col-

A bill (S. 4865) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Hazzard;

A bill (S. 4979) granting an increase of pension to Paul Fuchs; A bill (S. 4992) to provide an American register for the bark Otto Geldemeister:

A bill (S. 5294) granting an increase of pension to William F. Horn;

A bill (S. 5337) granting an increase of pension to Marietta L. Adams:

A bill (S. 5387) to change the terms of the circuit courts of the United States within the first circuit;

A bill (S. 5736) for the relief of the citizens of the French West Indies:

A bill (H. R. 53) for the protection of cities and towns in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 1380) granting an increase of pension to Mary

Tate;

A bill (H. R. 1479) granting an increase of pension to Michael Marnane

A bill (H. R. 1681) granting a pension to Erma G. Harvey;

A bill (H. R. 2129) granting an increase of pension to Warren W. H. Lawrence;

A bill (H. R. 2316) to correct the military record of Albert Boker

A bill (H. R. 2436) granting an increase of pension to James W. Roath;

A bill (H. R. 2486) granting an increase of pension to William Matthews

A bill (H. R. 3277) granting a pension to Frances J. Abercrombie:

A bill (H. R. 3756) granting an increase of pension to James C. G. Smith:

A bill (H. R. 4622) granting a pension to Frank W. Lynn;

A bill (H. R. 4927) granting a pension to George Tucker; A bill (H. R. 4993) granting a pension to Mary Shelton Huston; A bill (H. R. 5110) granting increase of pension to William H.

A bill (H. R. 5183) granting increase of pension to William Holdridge

A bill (H. R. 5190) granting increase of pension to Alvin J. Hartzell:

A bill (H. R. 5217) granting increase of pension to Elizabeth P. Sigfried;

A bill (H. R. 5600) granting increase of pension to John G. Sanders: A bill (H. R. 6434) granting a pension to Mary J. Fitch;

A bill (H. R. 6441) granting increase of pension to William H. Wood:

A bill (H. R. 6645) granting increase of pension to Ann E. Austin:

A bill (H. R. 7018) for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 7507) granting increase of pension to James M. Ashley

A bill (H. R. 7840) granting an increase of pension to Oliver

A bill (H. R. 7901) granting a pension to Dewitt Clinton Letts; A bill (H. R. 7982) granting increase of pension to William T.

Peterson A bill (H. R. 8016) granting increase of pension to Hannibal C.

St. Clair: A bill (H. R. 8351) granting a pension to Matthew V. Ellis; A bill (H. R. 8788) granting increase of pension to Jacob

Weidel: A bill (H. R. 8913) granting increase of pension to Rachel S.

Lyman A bill (H. R. 9156) granting increase of pension to Uriah

Garber A bill (H. R. 9656) granting increase of pension to Lunsford Y. Bailey:

A bill (H. R. 9777) granting a pension to Helen F. Lasher;

A bill (H. R. 9819) granting increase of pension to Robert A. A bill (H. R. 10122) granting increase of pension to John S.

Burket: A bill (H. R. 10396) granting increase of pension to Elvin A.

Esty;
A bill (H. R. 10496) granting a pension to James T. Steele;
A bill (H. R. 11353) making appropriations for the current and

contingent expenses of the Indian Department, etc.;

A joint resolution (S. R. 74) relating to publications of the Geological Survey; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 189) making an additional apropriation for expenses of the dedication of the statue of Marshal Rochambeau to be unveiled in the city of Washington.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1295) to amend an act authorizing the construction of a railway, street railway, motor, wagon, and pedestrian bridge over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., approved February 13, 1891, and amended by an act approved January 28, 1893, and by an act approved April 21, 1898, and to authorize the Omaha Bridge and Terminal Railway Company, successor to the Interstate Bridge and Street Railway Company, to complete, reconstruct, and change a bridge for railway and street railway purposes over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr.

The amendments were, on page 3, line 19, after "street railway," to strike out "cars;" and after "cars," where it occurs the second time, to insert:

, and the reasonably safe passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, foot passengers, and all road travel.

On page 5, line 15, to strike out "construction" and insert "reconstruction."

And to amend the title of the bill so as to read:

An act to amend an act authorizing the construction of a railway, street railway, motor, wagon, and pedestrian bridge over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., approved February 13, 1891, and amended by an act approved January 28, 1893, and by an act approved April 21, 1893, and to authorize the Omaha Bridge and Terminal Railway Company, successor to the Interstate Bridge and Street Railway Company, successor to the Interstate Bridge and Street Railway Company, to complete, reconstruct, and change a bridge for railway, street railway, vehicle, pedestrian, and other highway purposes over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. MILLIARD. I move that the Constants

Mr. MILLARD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

CHARLES D. PALMER.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18371) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Palmer, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as fol-

lows:
That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

I H GALLINGER

J. H. GALLINGER, N. B. SCOTT. PARIS GIBSON, Managers on the part of the Senate. HENRY B. GIBSON,
W. A. CALDERHEAD,
ROBERT W. MIERS,
Managers on the part of the House,

The report was agreed to.

ELIZABETH A. BURRILL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12054) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burrill, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

ndment.

J. H. GALLINGER,
WM. J. DEBOE,
GEO. TURNER,
Managers on the part of the Senate,
HENRY R. GIBSON,
W. A. CALDERHEAD,
ROBERT W. MIERS,
Managers on the part of the House,

The report was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HOAR. I present resolutions adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in support of the bill now pending be-fore the Congress of the United States to increase the pay of let-I ask that the resolutions be read and referred to ter carriers. the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The resolutions were read, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, as follows:

Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In the year 1902. Resolutions in support of the bill now pending before the Congress of the United States to increase the pay of letter carriers.

crease the pay of letter carriers.

Whereas a bill to increase the pay of letter carriers is now pending in Congress; and

Whereas we believe the enactment into law of said bill would be an act of justice to the thousands of faithful, industrious, and intelligent letter carriers who collect and deliver the United States mail: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts approves and heartily indorses H. B. bill No. 6279, and respectfully recommends to the Senators and Representatives from this Commonwealth in Congress to urge the members of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to make a favorable report on said bill, and that they use all honorable means to secure its enactment into law at the present session of Congress.

Resolved, That properly attested copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and also to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted April 30, 1902.

In senate, adopted in concurrence May 1, 1902.

A true copy.

Attest:

WM. M. OLIN.

WM. M. OLIN, Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HOAR presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Boston Turnverein of Massachusetts, expressing sympathy with the people of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of Local Division No. 2, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Jackson; of Maine Lodge No. 533, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Opechee; Local Division No. 1, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Openee; of Local Division No. 1, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Detroit, and of Lodge-No. 188, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Saginaw, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table. dered to lie on the table.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of St. Albans Division, No. 24, Order of Railway Conductors, of St. Albans, Vt., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FORAKER presented a petition of 41 citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of 360 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the internalrevenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which was re-

Ferred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 41 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to promote the efficiency of the clerical service of the United States Navy, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Federal Labor Union, No. 9604, of Fostoria; of Gill-Net Fishermen's Local Union No. 6896, of Cleveland, and of Distillery and Yeast Workers' Local Union No. 9117, of Cincinnati, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immi-

He also presented petitions of Local Division No. 299, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Lima; of Division No. 12, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Belpre; of Lodge No. 504, Brotherhood of road Telegraphers, of Belpre; of Lodge No. 504, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Marietta; of Lodge No. 466, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Marion; of Lodge No. 432, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Akron; of Hollingsworth Division, No. 100, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Columbus; of Devereux Division, No. 167, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Cleveland; of Put in Bay Division, No. 208, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Springfield; of Lake Shore Lodge, No. 84, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Ashtabula; of Division No. 26, Order of Railway Conductors, of Toledo; of Brady Lodge, No. 526, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Kent; of Nickel Plate Lodge, No. 377, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Con-Lodge, No. 377, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Conneaut; of Eclipse Lodge, No. 107, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Galion; of Chillicothe Division, No. 181, Order of Railway Conductors, of Chillicothe; of O. K. Lodge, No. 269, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Cincinnati; of Division No. 34, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Columbus; of Little Miami Division, No. 34, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Columbus; of Garfield Division, No. 20, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Collinwood, and of Division No. 14, Order of Railway Conductors, of Cleveland, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstraining orders and injunctions are considered.

straining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COCKRELL presented the petition of Isaac d'Isay, formerly captain, Twenty-seventh United States Infantry, and late captain, commissary of subsistence, United States Volunteers, praying for the enactment of legislation restoring him to the army by retirement; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Humboldt Turnverein of Missouri, expressing sympathy with the people of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MASON presented a petition of Lodge No. 456, Brother-hood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Local Division No. 294, Brother-hood of Locomotive Engineers, of Chicago; of Local Division No. 406, Order of Railway Conductors, of Monmouth; of Lodge No. 188, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Chicago; of Local Division No. 417, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Peoria; of Lodge No. 24, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Galesburg; of Local Division No. 512, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of East St. Louis; of Local Division No. 206, Order of gineers, of East St. Louis; of Local Division No. 206, Order of Railway Conductors, of Springfield; of Local Division No. 96, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Chicago; of Lodge No. 578, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Murphysboro; of Local Division No. 101, Order of Railway Conductors, of Matton; of Local Division No. 886, Order of Railway Conductors, of East St. Louis; of Lodge No. 456, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago; of Local Division No. 404, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Chicago; of Lodge No. 414, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago; of Lodge No. 6, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chicago; of Lodge No. 6, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Aurora; of Lodge No. 549, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Carbondale; of Lodge No. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Carbondale; of Lodge No. 505, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Fulton; of Local Division No. 212, Order of Railway Conductors, of Centralia; of Local Division No. 32, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Aurora; of Local Division No. 1, Order of Railway Conductors, of Chicago, and of Local Division No. 96, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of South Freeport, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5553) granting a pension to Nancy E. Hardy;

A bill (H. R. 9926) granting an increase of pension to James F.

Patton:

A bill (H. R. 5554) granting a pension to Egbert A. Stricksma; A bill (H. R. 13132) granting an increase of pension to Annie Cotter; and

A bill (H. R. 1046) granting an increase of pension to John J.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Matilda E. Clarke, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report

Mr. FOSTER of Washington, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5466) granting an increase of pension to Edgar T. Chamberlain, reported it with amendments,

and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5206) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wheeler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4809) granting a pension to Henry J. McFadden; and A bill (S. 5152) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. M. Martin.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4348) granting an increase of pension to James Thompson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SIMON, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1969) to conserve the flood waters of Lake Tahoe, in the States of California and Nevada, and to regulate the outflow thereof, reported

it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5403) granting a pension to Lyman Hotaling, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5505) adjusting certain conflicts respecting State school indemnity selections in lieu of school sections in abandoned military reservations, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon. without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 159) providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers in the north one-half of the Colville Indian Reservation, State of

Washington, and reserving the public lands for that purpose, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5298) for the relief of the widow of Lemuel J. Draper, late assistant surgeon, United States Navy, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and

the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 7541) granting a pension to Annie Shinn; and A bill (H. R. 13162) granting an increase of pension to Augustin M. Adams.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4766) granting a pension to James P. McClure, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2258) granting a pension to Francis Fox, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was

postponed indefinitely.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5299) to amend sections 897 and 903 of subchapter 7 of chapter 19 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

GEOLOGICAL AND WATER RESOURCES OF THE BLACK HILLS.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 1,000 copies of the Preliminary Description of the Geological and Water Resources of the Southern Half of the Black Hills and adjoining regions in South Dakota and Wyoming, recently prepared by Nelson Horatio Darton, under the direction of the United States Geological Survey; 500 copies for use of the House, 250 copies for use of the Senate, and 250 copies for use of the Secretary of the Interior.

THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 3,500 additional copies of the annual report of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1901; 1,000 copies for the use of Representatives, 500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Department of the Interior.

"MORALS OF JESUS OF NAZARETH."

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound, by photolithographic process, with an introduction of not to exceed 25 pages, to be prepared by Dr. Cyrus Adler, librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, for the use of Congress, 9,000 copies of Thomas Jefferson's Morals of Jesus of Nazareth, as the same appears in the National Museum; 3,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 6,000 copies for the use of the House the House.

THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be published and bound 6,000 copies of the State papers, and all correspondence bearing upon the purchase of the territory of Louisiana by the United States, including the treaty of purchase; 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 2,000 for the use of the Senate.

REPORT ON RURAL FREE-DELIVERY SERVICE.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 25,000 copies of so much of the First Assistant Postmaster-General's Report for 1900-1901 as relates to rural free-delivery service; 10,000 copies for the use of the Post-Office Department, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

FRANKS FOR SENDING OUT SEED.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 82) providing for the printing annually of franks required for sending out seed, to report it back and recommend concurrence in the amendment. I ask for action upon it at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the House of Representatives will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the resolving clause and

That the Public Printer shall furnish to the Department of Agriculture such franks as the Secretary of Agriculture may require for sending out seeds on Congressional orders, the franks to have printed thereon the facsimile signatures of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates, also the names of their respective States or Territories, and the words "United States Department of Agriculture, Congressional Seed Distribution," or such other printed matter as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct; the franks to be of such size and style as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture; the expense of printing the said franks to be charged to the allotment for printing and binding for the two Houses of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

LUCY I. JUDSON.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. QUARLES, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved. That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Lucy I. Judson, widow of C. K. Judson, late a folder of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FRENCH WEST INDIES AND ST. VINCENT.

Mr. CULLOM. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report a joint resolution appropriating the sum of \$500,000, including the \$200,000 already appropriated, for the relief of the French West Indies and St. Vincent, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 98) appropriating the sum of \$500, 000, including the \$200,000 already appropriated, for the relief of the French West Indies and St. Vincent, was read the first time

by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of money not exceeding \$500,000, including the \$200,000 already appropriated, to be expended by or under the direction of the President, in such manner as shall, in his judgment, most promptly and efficiently relieve the people of the French West Indies and of the island of St. Vincent, in their present distress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered

as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 5783) to provide for the control and management of United States penitentiaries, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

He also introduced a bill (S. 5784) to regulate commutation for good conduct for United States prisoners; which was read twice

by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 5785) to authorize the appointment of a commission to investigate the economic and industrial conditions of Cuba, and providing for the relief thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 5786) granting a pension to Julia A. Jordan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were

severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5787) granting an increase of pension to Philo Huntley; A bill (S. 5788) granting a pension to Solomon Rosenagle;

A bill (S. 5789) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Williamson;

A bill (S. 5790) granting an increase of pension to Humphrey B. Weekly;
A bill (S. 5791) granting a pension to Servetus Dawson;
A bill (S. 5792) granting an increase of pension to William A.

Knouff:

A bill (S. 5793) granting an increase of pension to William D. Everett; and
A bill (S. 5794) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J.

Gafford.

Mr. MASON introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5795) granting an increase of pension to William H. Barlow;

A bill (S. 5796) granting an increase of pension to Abner C. Arnold:

A bill (S. 5797) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Heindselman:

A bill (S. 5798) granting a pension to Joseph Thacker;

A bill (S. 5799) granting an increase of pension to Joel R. Harvey

A bill (S. 5800) granting a pension to Catherine Saunders;

A bill (S. 5801) granting a pension to George G. Eagle; A bill (S. 5802) granting an increase of pension to James Breeze;

A bill (S. 5803) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel A. Winks; and

A bill (S. 5804) granting an increase of pension to John Rip-

perdan.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 5805) regulating the duties and fixing the compensation of the customs inspectors at the port of Chicago; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 5806) for raising the wreck of the battle ship Maine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 5807) for the relief of the heirs

of Thomas W. McArthor, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 5808) for the relief of the heirs of R. G. Rawley; which was read twice by its title, and re-

ferred to the Committee on Claims. Mr. KEAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 100) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for an equestrian statue of the late Maj. Gen. William J. Sewell, United States Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

COURTS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. STEWART. I introduce a joint resolution, and I send to the desk a letter from the Attorney-General showing the necessity for its immediate passage. After the joint resolution is read I shall ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 99) fixing the time when certain provisions of the Indian appropriation act for the year ending June 30, 1903, shall take effect was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," shall take effect from and after July 1, 1902, except as otherwise specially provided therein.

Mr. STEWART. Now I ask for the reading of the letter explanatory of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D. C., May 12, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM M. STEWART,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

Hon. WILLIAM M. STEWART.

Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

Sir: In the bill or act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," there is legislation dividing the northern district of the Indian Territory into two districts; also authorizing the appointment of an additional United States marshal, an additional United States attorney, and other officers; also fixing additional places of holding terms of court, etc. It is deemed important that said legislation shall not take effect until July 1, 1962, in order that all necessary appointments may be made before that time and business arranged in accordance with the provisions of said act.

If said act shall be allowed to take effect immediately upon approval, much confusion is likely to result; also much additional expense will be caused thereby, as is more fully explained by the United States marshal for the northern district of the Indian Territory in his letter dated the 9th instant, a copy of which is inclosed herewith.

It is, therefore, considered important that a joint resolution (a draft of which is herewith inclosed) should be passed without delay, in order that it may be approved by the President before the date of the approval of the above-mentioned act.

Respectfully,

P. C. KNOX, Attorney-General.

Mr. HOAR. If the act itself—

Mr. STEWART. The joint resolution does not make an appropriation.

priation.

Mr. HOAR. If the act does not take effect at a certain time Mr. HOAR. If the act does not take effect at a certain time this legislation is unnecessary. If the act will take effect at a certain time by its own terms, how can a joint resolution passed before the act is signed by the President change it? As I understand the letter of the Attorney-General, it is that a pending bill not yet approved will take effect before the 1st of July, 1902, and that will make confusion in the courts, and so on. Therefore he proposes before that act is signed to have another act passed say ing it shall not take effect until after the 1st of July, 1902. I do

not see how that can be done.

Mr. STEWART. The act as to appropriations does not take effect until the 1st of July, but the act as to other matters, it is

supposed, will take effect immediately.

Mr. HOAR. That I understand. Let me repeat, because
Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let it be read again.

Mr. STEWART. Let the Secretary read the joint resolution. Mr. HOAR. Let me repeat before the joint resolution is read, the Attorney-General complains that a certain act now pending and not yet signed by its terms except as to appropriations will take effect before the 1st of July, 1902, and that will create inconvenience. Now, admit all that, then he proposes to provide by getting through a bill before that act gets through declaring that that act shall not take effect in these particulars until after the 1st of July. If that act means one thing in itself and is to

the 1st of July. It that act means one thing in itself and is to be the last act passed, how can our making a declaration before that time by a bill first passed help it?

Mr. STEWART. I can explain that.

Mr. HOAR. That is what I want to know.

Mr. STEWART. I can explain it, I think, readily. It will be passed right through and go to the President and he will sign the other first and make this the last bill. There is no trouble when it is the context of the president and the will sign the other first and make this the last bill. bout it. It can be very easily managed.

Mr. HOAR. The Attorney-General says in his letter he wants

this measure hurried through in order that the President may

sign it before he signs the other act.

Mr. STEWART. That can be arranged when both bills are

Mr. HOAR. I will not make any objection because I defer to the Senator from Nevada in this matter

Mr. STEWART. I shall certainly make that suggestion to the Attorney-General.

Mr. HOAR. The mere fact that I am a little puzzled by what my honorable friend says brings me back to his delightful old silver days

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be read.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let it be read again.

Mr. STEWART. Let it be read.

Mr. HOAR. Let the joint resolution be read, and then let the letter be read.

letter be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be

The Secretary again read the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. For information I should like to have the letter read.

Mr. HOAR. Let the Attorney-General's letter be read.
Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish to ask a question in connection with the joint resolution. Does the bill in terms provide that the sections to which the joint resolution relates shall take effect immediately?

Mr. STEWART. No; I think not, as to those provisions. However, the Attorney-General thinks that would be the case, because the appropriations are limited by the legislation.

Mr. HOAR. Now, let the letter be read again. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will be read.

The Secretary again read the letter of the Attorney-General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to ask one question. Does the joint resolution make the provision in the Indian appropriation bill, at the end of the bill, authorizing a new judicial circuit there, take effect on the 1st of July next?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without smend.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed. Mr. STEWART.

I ask that the letter of the marshal referred to in the letter of the Attorney-General be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES MARSHAL'S OFFICE,
NORTHERN DISTRICT, INDIAN TERRITORY,
Muskogee, Ind. T., May 9, 2902.

Maj. Frank Strong, General Agent, Washington, D. C.

General Agent, Washington, D. C.

Dear Major: I have just wired the Attorney-General that newspaper dispatches report passage of Indian appropriation bill containing provisions affecting the courts in the northern district and suggesting that if such provisions become operative immediately upon approval of the act by the President, such approval should be withheld for ten days to enable our courts to transfer cases, close up the Vinita grand jury, etc., and adjust the business of the district so as to save some thousands of dollars to the Government and avoid much confusion and no little resultant complications. I write you to confirm the telegram and to explain from my point of view the necessity for sending this message, and why I recommend the withholding of the approval of the President for not less than ten days.

Of course, this suggestion and recommendation is based upon the uncertainty at this time existing as to the date when the change in the district will take effect—whether immediately upon approval or on the 1st of July, next. If these court provisions of the bill do not go into effect until the 1st of July, there will be plenty of time for our courts and officials to arrange the business. Our district attorney "thinks" the bill will not go into effect until

July 1, and Judge Gill "thinks" the bill becomes effective—concerning the courts and division of district—immediately upon approval. I do not "think" either way as I await the instructions of the Department, by which I am solely governed, and invite your attention to the matter as I know that the Department is just as solicitous as possible to see the change made with the least possible confusion of the public business and the saving of all possible expense.

Vinita court opened last Monday marring with a rather becomes all the court opened last Monday marring with a rather becomes all the court opened last Monday marring with a rather becomes all the court opened last Monday marring with a rather becomes all the court of t

the least possible confusion of the public business and the saving of all possible expense.

Vinita court opened last Monday morning with a rather heavy grand jury docket. At least 30 important cases—murder, robbery, burglary, lareenies, etc.—properly belong in the courts of the new western district for trial, and are being transferred as rapidly as the indictments are returned into court. Some of them can not be reached before the 15th, and possibly the 17th. The proposed law does not make provision for transfers of cases. For instance, one case before the Vinita court (grand jury) is that of three negroes charged with two murders committed near Wewoka, 178 miles from Vinita. A small number of witnesses only appear before the grand jury. Indictments have been found and defendants served with certified copies of the indictment and list of witnesses. Forty-eight hours must elapse before they can be arraigned. When arraigned they will plead not guilty and the cases—there are two cases against each of these three—will be transferred to Wewoka for trial. In the trial of the cases at least a score of witnesses will be required. All live within 10 miles of Wewoka and more than 180 miles from Vinita. You can see that the saving of expense in mileage will be quite an item. From 20 to 30 cases will be thus transferred from Vinita to Wewoka, Muskogee, and Wagoner for trial.

miles of Wewoka and more than 180 miles from Vinita. You can see that the saving of expense in mileage will be quite an item. From 20 to 30 cases will be thus transferred from Vinita to Wewoka, Muskogee, and Wagonr for trial.

There are also pending on the dockets of other courts several cases—probably aggregating fifty—which should be transferred from district to district. This can be done under present laws, all the courts being in the one district. But when new law goes into effect and two districts are thus created these transfers would cease, as there is no law authorizing transfers, and the court of appeals has held that criminal cases can not be transferred from one district to another under any condition of plea. The present juries at Vinita are made up of residents of the country within the new western as well as the new northern district. The moment the law is operative these juries must be reorganized and all members residing in new western district be excused from service, or the indictments of the grand jury or verdicts of petit jury will be voidable, if not absolutely void.

As affecting me personally, or rather officially, in the proper discharge of my duties, it is important for me to know whether or not the new law of itself makes me the marshal of the western district without further action by the President, the Department, or myself. Or will it be necessary for me to be reappointed, take a new oath of office, and file a new bond? If the former, will I continue my official work uninterruptedly, or will I need to close my accounts as marshal of the northern district and begin anew as marshal of western district? If required to close my accounts, an exact date should be fixed in advance, as I am daily incurring and paying hundreds of dollars of expense, especially during the session of court, in paying jurors and witnesses. My deputies are daily making arrests and serving process, Their tenure of office and authority as deputies are dependent upon my own standing. A fixed date in advance will en

GENERAL PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL.

Mr. BAILEY and Mr. WELLINGTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

LEASING OF INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate certain alleged charges in connection with the leasing of the Indian lands on Standing Rock Reservation, contained in a letter of W. V. Wade in Senate Document No. 212, first session Fifty-seventh Congress, and for that purpose to send for persons and papers, take testimony, and have leave to sit during the sessions of Congress; and that the necessary expenses be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control its Contingent Expenses.

MARIA J. WILSON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2951) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. Wilson, which was, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate commendment made by the House of Representatives. I move that the Senate concur in the

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the Committee on Privileges and Elections may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan

asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BANES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 12th instant approved and signed the act (S. 4868) granting an increase of pension to James H. Walker.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13895) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be read for action on the amendments of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments shall first receive consideration. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 3, line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture from \$4,240 to \$4,960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Weather Bureau." on page 8, after line 12, to insert:

For the purchase of sites and erection of not less than six buildings for use as Weather Bureau observatories, and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses; plans and specifications to be prepared, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and work done under the supervision of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, including the purchase of instruments, furniture, supplies, flagstaffs, and storm-warning towers, to properly equip these stations, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 7, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Weather Bureau from \$1,201,760 to \$1,248,760. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Animal Industry, on page 10, line 3, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one zoologist in the Bureau of Animal Industry from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 6, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Bureau of Animal Industry from \$1,246,930 to \$1,247,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 14, line 11, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry from \$3,000 to \$4,000; in line 13, to increase the salary of one plant physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of Bureau in absence of chief, from \$2,500 to \$2,750; in line 20, to increase the salary of one chief plant in the Dawson of Diagrams. salary of one chief clerk in the Bureau of Plant Industry from \$1,800 to \$2,000, and on page 15, line 2, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Bureau of Plant Industry from \$61,280 to \$62,730.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 15, after the word "development," to insert "to study and find methods for preventing the algal and other contaminations of water supplies;" on page 17, line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 3, before the word "office," to insert "laboratory and;" in line 6, before the word "thousand," to insert "and twenty-five," and in the same line after the word "dollars," to insert "of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

General expenses, Burean of Plant Industry: vegetable nathological and

diately available; 'so as to make the clause read:

General expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry; vegetable pathological and physiological investigations: Investigating the nature of diseases injurious to fruits, fruit trees, grain, cotton, vegetable, and other useful plants; experiments in the treatment of the same; the study of plant physiology in relation to crop production and the improvement of crops by breeding and selection; to investigate the diseases affecting citrus fruits, pineapples, and truck crops grown during the winter in the Southern States; to investigate canaigre and other tannin-bearing plants; to investigate and report upon the diseases affecting plants on the Pacific coast; to originate or introduce improved varieties of fruits and vegetables in cooperation with the section of seed and plant introduction; to study the relation of soil and climatic conditions to diseases of plants, particularly with reference to the California vine diseases and diseases of the sugar beet, in cooperation with the Bureau of Soils, and for other purposes connected with the discovery and practical application of improved methods of crop production; to continue the work of

originating, by breeding and selection, in cooperation with the other divisions of the Department and the experiment stations, new varieties of oranges, lemons, and other tropical and subtropical fruits more resistant to cold and disease and of better quality; varieties of wheat and other cereals more resistant to rust and smut and better suited to the various sections of this country; varieties of cotton more resistant to disease and of longer and better staple, and varieties of pears and apples more resistant to blight and better adapted for export; to investigate the causes of decay in forest timber and timber used for construction purposes, and to devise means for preventing the decay of the same; to investigate the practical application in agriculture of the fixation of atagospheric nitrogen by bacteria and other microorganisms in soils and in the root tubercles of leguminous and other plants; to cultivate and distribute these nitrogen fixers and to determine the conditions most favorable to their development; to study and find methods for preventing the algal and other contaminations of water supplies; the employment of investigators, local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and student scientific aids at an annual salary of \$480 each, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for gas and electric current; purchase of chemicals and apparatus required in the field and laboratory; necessary traveling expenses; the preparation of reports and illustrations; the rent and repairs of a building, not to exceed \$3,000 per annum; all necessary the boratory and office fixtures and supplies, and for other expenses connected with the practical work of the investigations, \$125,000, of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 2, after the word "divisions," to insert "and bureaus;" in line 3, before the word "experiment," to insert "the;" in line 12, before the word "experimental," to insert "investigations and;" and in line 17, before the word "experimental," to insert "investigations and;" so as to make the clause read:

fore the word "experimental," to insert "investigations and;" so as to make the clause read:

Pomological investigations: Investigating, collecting, and disseminating information relating to the fruit industry; the collection and distribution of seeds, shrubs, trees, and specimens; and for collecting and modeling fruits, regetables, and other plants, and furnishing duplicate models to the experiment stations of the several States, as far as found practicable; the employment of investigators, local and special agents, clerks, assistants, student scientific aids at an annual salary of \$480 each, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for all necessary office fixtures and supplies and for traveling and other necessary expenses, to continue the investigations and experiments in the introduction of the culture of European table grapes and the study of the diseases that affect them, for the purpose of discovering remedies therefor, this work to be done in cooperation with the section of seed and plant introduction; to investigate in cooperation with the other divisions and bureaus of the Department and the experiment stations of the several States the market conditions affecting the fruit and vegetable trade in the United States and foreign countries, and the methods of harvesting, packing, storing, and shipping fruit and vegetables, and for experimental shipments of fruits and vegetables to foreign countries, for the purpose of increasing the exportation of American fruits and vegetables, and for all necessary expenses connected with the practical work of the same, and such fruits and vegetables as are needed for these investigations and experimental shipments may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is authorized to apply the moneys received from the sales of such fruits and vegetables toward the continuation and

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 6, to increase the appropriation for rent and ordinary repairs of a building for office and laboratory purposes for botanical investigations and experiments from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 13, after the word "grasses," to insert "for rent and ordinary repairs of a building for laboratory and office purposes, not to exceed \$1,200;" so as to read:

Grass and forage-plant investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of grasses, forage plants, and animal foods in cooperation with other divisions of the Department; to collect and purchase seeds, roots, and specimens of valuable economic grasses and forage plants for investigation; experimental cultivation and distribution, and for experiments and reports upon the best methods of extirpating Johnson and other noxious and destructive grasses; for rent and ordinary repairs of a building for laboratory and office purposes, not to exceed \$1,200, etc.

The amondment was accredited.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 16, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the erection of a suitable seed warehouse on the Department grounds for receiving, storing, cleaning, and properly preparing the seed handled by the Department.

So as to make the proviso read:

So as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That \$20,000 of the sum thus appropriated, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used to collect, purchase, test, propagate, and distribute rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries for experiments with reference to their introduction into this country; and the seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants thus collected, purchased, tested, and propagated shall not be included in general distribution, but shall be used for experimental tests to be carried on with the cooperation of the agricultural experiment stations, \$270,000, of which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the erection of a suitable seed warehouse on the Department grounds for receiving, storing, cleaning, and properly preparing the seed handled by the Department.

The approximant was agreed to

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the Bureau of Plant Industry from \$601,780 to \$627,730. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Forestry," on page 27, line 11, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Forestry from \$3,000 to \$3,500; in line 11 to increase the appropriation for the salary of one assistant forester from \$1,800 to \$2,000; in line 12 to reduce the appropriation for the salary of one assistant forester from \$2,000 to \$1,800, and on page 28, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the Bureau of Forestry from \$37,360 to \$37,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 7, after the word "same," to insert "to investigate and test American timber and timber trees;" in line 20, before the word "thousand," to strike out "forty-five" and insert "sixty-three;" and in line 21, after the word "dollars," to strike out "of the latter amount;" so as to make the clause read:

to make the clause read:

General expenses, Bureau of Forestry: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, forest reserves, forest fires, and lumbering; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to collect and distribute valuable economic forest tree seeds and plants; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in conducting experiments and investigations in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and for collating, digesting, reporting, illustrating, and printing the results of such experiments and investigations; for the purchase of all necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures; for freight and express charges, and traveling and other necessary expenses, \$283,000, of which sum not to exceed \$6,000 may be used for rent, and \$700 may be used in payment of rent for the months of March, April, May, and June, 1902. And the employees of the Bureau of Forestry outside of the city of Washington may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, without additional expense to the Government, be granted leaves of absence not to exceed fifteen days in any one year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the "Bureau of Forestry" from \$282,360 to \$300,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Chemistry," on page 29, line 7, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry from \$3,000 to \$3,500; in line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the salaries of the Chief and clerks in the Bureau of Chemistry from \$12,700 to \$13,200.

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. PROCTOR. On page 31, line 23, before the word "occupied," I move to strike out "building;" and insert "buildings;" so as to read:

For the rent of buildings occupied by the Bureau of Chemistry.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. On page 32, line 21, before the word "sirup," I move to strike out "cane;" so as to read:

And reporting the proper treatment and process in order to secure uniform grade and quality of first-class marketable table sirup.

The amendment was agreed to.
The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 32, line 23, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Bureau of Chemistry from \$73,200 to \$73,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Soils," on page 33, line 2, before the word "dollars," to insert "five hundred;" in line 17, before the word "seven," to strike out "one watchman" and insert "two watchmen at;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "each, \$1,440;" in line 21, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirty-eight" and insert "thirty-nine;" in the same line, before the word "hundred," to strike out "nine" and insert "six;" and in the same line, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixty" and insert "eighty;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Soils, salaries. One soil physicist, who shall be Chief of Bureau.

Bureau of Solls, salaries: One soil physicist, who shall be Chief of Bureau, \$3,500; 1 scientist \$2,500; 1 scientist, \$2,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 2 scientists, at \$1,800 each, \$3,800; 2 scientists, at \$1,600 each, \$3,200; 2 scientists, at \$1,400 each, \$2,800; 2 scientists, at \$1,200 each, \$2,400; 1 scientist, \$1,000; one stenographer, \$1,200; 1 clerk, class 3, \$1,600; 1 clerk, class 2, \$1,400; 5 clerks, class 1, \$6,000; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$3,000; 1 clerk, \$340; 2 watchmen, at \$720 each, \$1,440; 1 messenger, \$720; 1 charwoman, \$480; in all, \$39,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, before the words United States," to strike out "continental" and insert "the;" so as to read:

General expenses, Bureau of Soils: Investigation of the relation of soils to climate and organic life; for the investigation of the texture and composition of soils in the field and laboratory; for the investigation of the cause and prevention of the rise of alkali in the soils of the irrigated districts; the investigation of the relation of soils to drainage and seepage waters, and of

methods for the prevention of the accumulation of and injury from seepage waters in irrigated districts; for investigations of soils in the United States and for indicating upon maps or plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the Bureau of Soils from \$168,960 to \$169,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 6, to increase the total appropriation for the salary of one entomologist who shall be chief of Division of Entomology, from \$2,500 to \$2,750; and in line 14, to increase the total appropriation for the salaries of the chief and assistants in the Division of Entomology, from \$11,700 to \$11,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 13, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Division of Entomology, from \$57,200 to \$57,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 15, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one biologist, who shall be chief of Division of Biological Survey, from \$2,500 to \$2,750; and in line 25, to increase the total appropriation for the salaries of one chief and assistants in the Division of Biological Survey, from \$17,600 to \$17,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Division of Biological Survey from \$45,600 to \$45,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 14, to insert:

Total for Division of Publications, \$228,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 22, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "; in all, for the Division of Statistics, \$141,160;" on page 42, line 1, after the word "shall," to strike out:

On or before July 1, 1908, transfer to and consolidate with the Weather Bureau and under the direction of its Chief all work of the Department of Agriculture relating to the gathering and compilation of statistics by the Division of Statistics."

And insert:

Report whether it is advisable to consolidate with the Weather Bureau all work of the Department of Agriculture relating to the gathering and compilation of crop reports and statistics; and if so, to submit a plan for such consolidation.

So as to make the proviso read:

So as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the monthly crop report, issued on the 10th day of each month, shall embrace a statement of the condition of the crops, by States, in the United States, with such explanations, comparisons, and information as may be useful for illustrating the above matter, and that it shall be submitted to, and officially approved by, the Secretary of Agriculture before being issued or published, \$94,200, of which sum not more than \$40,00 shall be expended for salaries in the city of Washington, D. C.; report whether it is advisable to consolidate with the Weather Bureau all work of the Department of Agriculture relating to the gathering and compilation of crop reports and statistics; and if so, to submit a plan for such consolidation.

Mr. DECOTOR Conserved 42, line 1, offer the world "chell!"

Mr. PROCTOR. On page 42, line 1, after the word "shall," I move to insert "at the next session of Congress."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The Secretary. On page 42, line 1, after the word "shall," it is proposed to insert "at the next session of Congress;" so as to

The Secretary of Agriculture shall, at the next session of Congress, report whether it is advisable to consolidate with the Weather Bureau all work of the Department of Agriculture relating to the gathering and compilation of crop reports and statistics.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 42, after line 9, to insert:

Total for Division of Statistics, \$141,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 5, after the word "dollars," to strike out "; in all, for the Division of Foreign Markets, \$15,000;" so as to make the clause read:

Markets, \$15,000; So as to make the clause read:

General expenses, Division of Foreign Markets: Investigations concerning
the fessibility of extending the demands of foreign markets for the agricultural products of the United States, and to secure, as far as may be, a change
in the methods of supplying farm products to foreign countries, employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required
in making investigations in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in
collecting, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such investigations; traveling expenses and freight and express charges; telephone and
telegraph service; and all necessary supplies and apparatus; \$6,500.

The appendicular as general to

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 7, after the word "of," to strike out "publications" and insert "foreign markets;" in line 8, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two

hundred and twenty-eight" and insert "fifteen;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Total for division of foreign markets, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 14, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one cataloguer" and insert "two cataloguers, at;" in line 15, after the word "dollars," to insert "each, \$2,000;" in line 17, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one messenger" and insert "two messengers, at;" in line 18, after the word "dollars," to insert "each, \$1,440;" in line 19, before the word "thousand," to strike out "nine" and insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "each, \$1,440;" in line 21, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "each, \$1,440;" in line 21, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "each, \$1,440;" in line 19, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and insert "ten;" and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to insert "ten;" and insert "ten "seven hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Library, salaries: One librarian, \$1,800; 1 assistant librarian, \$1,400; 1 clerk (who shall be a translator), \$1,200; 1 cataloguer, \$1,200; 2 cataloguers, at \$1,000 each, \$2,000; 2 clerks, \$840 each, \$1,680; 2 messengers, at \$720 each, \$1,440; in all, \$10,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The anext amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 25, after the word "series," to insert "for binding periodicals;" and on page 44, line 1, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seven" and insert "ten;" so as to make the clause read:

General expenses for Department library: Purchase of technical books of reference, technical papers, and technical periodicals necessary for the work of the Department, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series, for binding periodicals, and for library fixtures, shelving, library cards, and other material, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the library of the Department of Agriculture from \$16,000 to \$20,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Miscellaneous," on page 45, line 13, before the word "hundred," to strike out "seven" and insert "eight;" in line 14, before the word "thousand," to strike out "and eighty-nine;" in the same line, before the word "thousand," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "thirty-three" and insert "forty;" so as to read:

Agricultural experiment stations: To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1882, and of the acts supplementary thereto," and to enforce the execution thereof, \$800,000; \$40,000 of which sum shall be payable upon the order of the Secretary of Agriculture to enable him to carry out the provisions of section 3 of said act of March 2, 1887, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 14, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the agricultural experiment stations from \$792,000 to \$800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 10, after the word "waters," to insert "at home or abroad;" in line 12, after the word "use," to insert "and upon plans for the removal of seepage and surplus waters by drainage;" in line 17, after the word "labor," to insert "and payment of rent;" and in line 24, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to make the clause read:

five; "so as to make the clause read:

Irrigation investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the laws as affecting irrigation and the rights of riparian proprietors and institutions relating to irrigation and upon the use of irrigation waters, at home or abroad, with especial suggestions of better methods for the utilization of irrigation waters in agriculture than those in common use, and upon plans for the removal of seepage and surplus waters by drainage, and upon the use of different kinds of power for irrigation and other agricultural purposes, and for the preparation, printing, and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation, including employment of labor and payment of rent in the city of Washington or elsewhere; and the agricultural experiment stations are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out said investigations in such manner and to such extent as may be warranted by a due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States and Territories as may be mutually agreed upon, \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 2, after the word "of," to strike out "persons, other than day laborers," and insert "clerks;" so as to make the clause read:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to submit, in the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1994, and annually thereafter, immediately following estimates of each of the respective offices, bureaus, and divisions of the Department of Agriculture, a statement showing in detail the number of clerks who were employed in the District of Columbia upon regular and continuous work for thirty days or more during the previous fiscal year in or under such offices, bureaus, or divisions under authority of and paid from general appropriations, indicating in the case of every such employment the rate of compensation received and the appropriation from which paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended. Mr. FOSTER of Washington. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The Secretary. On page 7, line 22, after the words "Hawaiian Islands," it is proposed to insert "and, if practicable and useful, in the Aleutian Islands."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2295.

Mr. BAILEY. Pending that motion, Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, and that inquiry is, What has become of the resolution in relation to special embassies at coronations which is on the President's table?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is on the table, subject to the call of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil

government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have listened with interest and some surprise to the debate on this bill. It has been more earnest and at times more acrimonious than any debate to which I have ever listened in this Chamber. Although I was here during the exciting period of reconstruction and during the debates on the various questions arising out of the settlement of the war of the rebellion, I have heard nothing to compare with this debate, and I am at a loss to know what has inspired it. There is nothing in the bills of the majority and of the minority to excite animosity or strong language.

The war with Spain was brought on by both parties. Democratic party, if I remember aright, was most urgent for the war. So far as the war with Spain is concerned, it was the result of the action of both branches of Congress and of the Executive, the Executive following rather than leading. So there can be nothing to excite animosities or criticism growing out of the bringing on of the war. That was a Democratic measure quite

as much as it was a Republican measure.

Then came the settlement,

THE TREATY OF PEACE.

That was ratified by a two-thirds majority of the Senate, several Democrats voting for it, and it was about as much a Democratic measure as it was a Republican measure. At all events, it was the measure of the Government. We acquired the islands through the ratification of the treaty. Subsequent to the treaty both parties joined in making appropriations to carry on such operations in the Philippines as were necessary. The ratification of the treaty imposed upon the Executive the duty to take possession of the islands, and to take care of them. It was the duty of the Executive to provide a military government without any action of Congress. That is what has been done in all other cases.

Inat is what has been done in an other cases.

In California, for example, there was no legislation regulating affairs for four years—from 1846 to 1850. Military officers administered the law under the Executive. They formed a State government and proceeded without any action of Congress. There is no question about the authority or the duty of the President to do all this.

For the present status in the Philippines

BOTH PARTIES ARE RESPONSIBLE.

The country is responsible. It is the United States which has acted to bring about the present condition of things. Why should there be any excitement about that? The majority report provides for a temporary government there; it provides for the acquiring of the title to mines; it provides for a currency; it provides for many necessary things in order that the country may have some law under which it may proceed, in order that business may be carried on. I do not hear much criticism of the provisions of the bill for carrying on the government, and so far as holding the Diller. as holding the Philippines is concerned, the majority and minority are in accord. The difference between the majority and the minority relates to the future

The second section of the bill proposed as a substitute by the

minority reads as follows:

That the United States shall continue to occupy and govern said archipelago until the people thereof have established a government, and until sufficient guaranties have been obtained for the performance of our treaty obligations with Spain and for the safety of those inhabitants who have adhered to the United States, and for the maintenance and protection of all rights which have accrued under the authority thereof.

Both sides are agreed that the Philippines shall be held at resent. There is no division on that subject. There need be no present. There is no division on that subject. There need be no excitement about the present occupation. It is thoroughly concurred in. Then the only point made by the minority worth con-

sidering is the question of making promises. The minority insist that we should promise the Philippines to do in the future something we are not ready to do now. I do not believe in making promises in advance. I think we have had enough such promises.

I do not believe 5 per cent of the American people are satisfied

THE PROMISE WE MADE TO CUBA.

I think we ought to have held Cuba. I think we will get it in time, but it will not be the result of the war, as it should have been. I think that promise is going to make us a great deal of been. I think that promise is going to make us a great deal of trouble, as it has already made us trouble; but we made the prom-ise, and we are going to carry it out in good faith. We are asked to promise these Filipinos that when they have established a form of government, and have given guaranties that they will protect the amigos-those who have been our friends-that they will carry out our treaty obligations with Spain and all other

nations, we will give them their independence.

How long will it take us to get those guaranties? Considering the character of the people with whom we have to deal, we know thatit will be a long time before they can establish a government which can perform our treaty obligations with Spain, securing the safety of the inhabitants of the islands who have adhered to the United States and maintained and protected the rights which have accrued under the authority of the United States. These people know nothing about treaty obligations. There are different grades among them. A great many of them are savages. A great many of them are the descendants of pirates, and are engreat many of them are the descendants of pirates, and are engaged in no legitimate business. It will be some time, from the evidence we have, before these people can be trusted to comply with the conditions required by the minority. Will it not be time enough to act when we know that such a stable government has been formed? If we make this promise now there will be a difference of opinion as to when the conditions have been complied

with, and the uncertainty may continue for the next fifty years.

It may be wrong to have taken upon ourselves this responsibility. The result of the war may have been unfortunate, but

that is not the question.

WE HAVE THE PHILIPPINES.

We can not let them go now, as all agree. We are under obliga-tions to Spain and to the world to see that the rights of person and property are protected. All agree that we can not turn the gov-ernment over to them now, and we do not know when we can. No-body can say when a stable government will be established. And now it is proposed to confuse and embarrass the situation by vain promises. The minority proposes to agitate the country on the question of what that promise will be—not what we will do, but what we will tell them we will do. Such an issue seems to me very foolish but not very exciting. Why tell them what we will do under certain conditions when we have not any reasonable hope that those conditions will exist in the present generation.

The enemy with whom we are dealing is a very different man from what many of us suppose. We did not know anything about him until recently. He has a history which is illustrated in his recent conduct. It is not a new history. It is nearly five hundred years old since it began.

The islands were discovered by Magellan, and he was killed at the time of making that discovery. If the Secretary will read what I have marked, I will be obliged to him. It begins on page 12 and ends on page 13 of Comyn's Philippine Islands, which is authentic Spanish history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLINGTON in the chair). If there be no objection, the Secretary will read as requested. The Secretary read as follows:

The Secretary read as follows:

The Archipelago of St. Lazarus, the name originally given to the Philippine Islands, was discovered by Hernando de Magallanes, who left Seville in August, 1519, with five ships, manned by 234 men, and fitted out by orders of Charles V. On reaching the South Sea, by the passage still bearing the name of its discoverer, he had only three vessels left; but with these he proceeded on in quest of the Spice Islands, the chief plea that had given rise to so daring an enterprise. On the day of St. Lazarus he discovered a group of islands, which he called by the name of the Saint, and landing at Botoan, belonging to the province of Caraga, in the island of Mindanao, he took possession of the new discovery in the name of the King of Spain, and there the first mass was celebrated.

He next proceeded to the island of Zebu, and gained over its chief, as well as that of Dimasua. Mactan, a small island in front of Zebu, however, resisted the Spaniards, and its chief, confident of his own strength, challenged Magallanes to land, who accepted the challenge. He took with him 50 Spaniards, attacked the Indians by advancing through a deep morass; but being wounded by an arrow, he died on the field, together with six of his men, and the rest retreated on board. Thus perished, though not ingloriously, the renowned Magallanes, whose name, in the annals of the New World, deserves to rank immediately after that of Columbus.

After the death of their leader the Spaniards chose Juan Serrano for their commander, and the Indians after this recent misfortune, no longer considering them as demigods or invincible, began to plot their destruction. They artfully disguised their designs and persuaded the new commander, accompanied by 24 of his companions, to be present at a feast prepared by Hamabar, chief of Zebu. In the midst of the entertainment concealed Indians rushed on the unsuspecting Spaniards and murdered the whole of them, with the exception of Serrano, who escaped to his ships.

Mr. STEWART. That is the first account we have of the Filipinos, and it is similar to the account of affairs as reported in Samar. After the natives had made friends with our soldiers, and while the soldiers were at breakfast, they were assassinated. is the history of these people. Samar is near the other island spoken of by the historian. They are the same character of men. That is the character of the people with whom we have to deal, and it has been their character from the time of the discovery of those islands until quite recently.

There are now robbers wherever they can find plunder. There

has been piracy going on there which could not be suppressed, and the European nations have had their fleets there to suppress piracy. They suppressed it in every other part of the world, but there are

living on some of those islands

THE WORST POSSIBLE CHARACTERS.

That does not refer to all of the population. The population of Luzon were always better, but their coast towns were robbed, and they had to get into the interior to get away from these pirates. Samar was one of the piratical islands. All the islands were involved in piracy, but Luzon had always a better character

than the balance.

In fighting these pirates as recently as 1846, Mr. Brooke, who was an Englishman in charge of an expedition there—

Mr. HANNA. An Englishman?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; he was an Englishman. He had charge of an expedition. All the world had been fighting them, trying to suppress them. He was criticised, I suppose the same as our soldiers are criticised, by fault-finders at home while he was try-

ing to suppress piracy.

I read from Brooke's Borneo, volume 2, page 84. He says:

There seems to me to be a contradictory sort of sentiment pervading a portion of the English public which it is difficult to comprehend. They particularly desire to suppress piracy, but when active and intelligent means are put in operation to effect this purpose they are horrified at the possibility of coercive measures being employed.

Very much like our people here. They want us to establish a stable government, but we are not allowed to use the only methods possible to that end.

He goes on:

He goes on:

What do they expect? Do they really imagine that piracy is to be suppressed by argument or preaching? Do they propose to appeal to the tender feelings of these head takers? Is it by mild morality, moral maxims, Harvey's Meditations, mesmeric influence, a problem of Euclid, or Aristotle's Logic that they would overcome the difficulty and gain the desirable object of opening these waters to the peaceful trader? For my own part, I am anxious and ready to listen patiently to any well-digested plan, but, at the same time, I confess myself at a loss to discover any remedy for the deadly evil but the one which I have as yet successfully applied.

We have undertaken to establish a responsible government in Samar where no government ever existed. While I am opposed to cruelty, and while I reprobate the order of General Smith—

to cruelty, and while I reprobate the order of General Smith-

NOBODY CAN JUSTIFY AN ORDER OF THAT KIND-

there are many things occurring in all wars that are not justifiable. There is no doubt that many things occurred in the Southern army which Southern people regretted, but they did not stop the war for that reason; and so in the Northern army there were many things that were not justifiable, as I know, from both sides. I know that the South regretted Fort Pillow, and the North regretted many things that were done, but that did not stop the war.

There has been in this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, constant war. If you will read some of the accounts of proceedings in New England or in Virginia or in Pennsylvania in regard to the early wars with the Indians, you will find that our people were driven to desperation and adopted methods which would not be justified in civilized warfare. That always occurs. Why,

GENERAL JACKSON DID THINGS

for which he was censured at the time, but not condemned. He was afterwards elected President of the United States for two terms, and has a most illustrious record. I will read, as an illustration of what occurs under peculiar circumstances, from Appleton's Encyclopedia of American Biography, volume 3, page 378:

ton's Encyclopedia of American Biography, volume 3, page 378:

At St. Marks his troops captured an aged Scotch trader and friend of the Indian, named Alexander Arbuthnot; near Suwanee, some time afterwards they seized Robert Ambrister, a young English lieutenant of marines, nephew of the governor of New Providence. Jackson believed that these men had incited the Indians to make war upon the United States, and were now engaged in aiding and abetting them in their hostilities. They were tried by court-martial at St. Marks. On very insufficient evidence Arbuthnot was found guilty and sentenced to be hanged.

Appearances were somewhat more strongly against Ambrister. He did not make it clear what his business was in Florida, and threw himself upon the mercy of the court, which at first condemned him to be shot, but on further consideration commuted the sentence to 50 lashes and a year's imprisonment. Jackson arbitrarily revived the first sentence and Ambrister was accordingly shot. A few minutes afterwards Arbuthnot was hanged from the yardarm of his own ship, declaring with his last breath that his country would avenge him.

Jackson was criticised largely for this, but it was impossible for people generally to realize all the circumstances surrounding it. He opened Florida, however, and through him we acquired Florida. General Crook did many things that could not be justified in ordinary warfare.

HE WAS DEALING WITH A CRIMINAL RACE,

very much like these people of Samar. The characteristics of the Apaches, from the best history I can get, were very similar to

those of the people of Samar.

The Apaches were a peculiar tribe of Indians. They were not a tribe originally, but they were guards picked up by the priests who went from Lake Superior to Santa Fe and down through into northern Mexico and Arizona and Sonora a hundred years before there was any communication with the City of Mexico. priests selected young men from each tribe they passed through as a guard. This guard got to be quite numerous, and war was its business. Its members raided the country. They went down into the City of Mexico and robbed and plundered and got back with their plunder without serious opposition.

A most terrible race of men were the Apaches--stealing women, killing males and the children, and taking what plunder they pleased. They roamed all over Mexico. They were the terror of the whole country. They interfered with and delayed the settlement of Arizona. Governor Safford, from Nevada, who was appointed by President Grant governor of Arizona, wrote continually to me on the subject. I told him I wanted particular facts. I told him to give me the facts of the conduct of the men composing this tribe. He sent me a book including over 400 permes posing this tribe. He sent me a book including over 400 names of men, women, and children—mostly men—who had been murdered and the circumstances substantiated by affidavits as to where the murders had occurred. I took it to President Grant and he assigned to General Crook the duty of subduing them.

General Stoneman had charge, but President Grant put Crook

in command on account of the conditions as described by Safford's report. General Crook then had to deal with those terrible people. No other officer had been able to do anything with them, and

HE SUBDUED THEM BY CUNNING.

He induced them to fight one against another. There was a most horrible Indian war for a couple of years, but the Apaches were overcome and the country was quelled, and life and property made secure.

Harsh means had to be adopted. They are not the means that would be used in civilized warfare. Those methods would not

be adopted by civilized nations.

You would not do these acts in warfare among civilized men.

You would not do these acts in warfare among civilized men. Crook gave them a forcible order when he started in his work.

He sent an ultimatum to the chiefs to return to their reservations or "be wiped from the face of the earth." No attention was paid to his demand, and he attacked them in the Tonto Basin, a stronghold deemed impregnable, and enforced submission. In 1875 he was ordered to quell the disturbances in the Sioux and Cheyenne nations in the Northwest, and defeated those Indians in the battle of Powder River, Wyoming.

In March another battle resulted in the destruction of 125 lodges, and in June the battle of Tongue River was a victory for Crook. A few days later the battle of the Rosebud gave him another, when the maddened savages massed their forces and succeeded in crushing Custer. (See Custer, George Armstrong.) Crook, on receiving reenforcements, struck a severe blow at Slim Buttes, Dakota, and followed it up with such relentless vigor that by May, 1877, all the hostile tribes in the Northwest had yielded.

Crook adopted more severe means in all his wars than have ever been adopted in the Philippines. He did not write so many orders-he acted; and he was made a major-general for his great services in saving human life. Those countries are now inhabited, and Arizona is coming in as a State. I hope the Senate will concur in the action of the House and admit Arizona as a State.

Now, I condemn any cruelty that can be avoided. I CONDEMN THE ORDER OF SMITH

as foolish and wicked. There was no necessity for giving it. do not know whether anything was done under it or not. order must be condemned, but the general condemnation of our soldiers there is without any reason at all. We know that they We know the American have acted as humanely as was possible. Army always does

There will be violations of military laws even among the most civilized nations, and court-martials are frequent even there, but where the enemy makes war by deceit, from ambush, and never meets in the open field, he is an assassin, as he is in the Philippines, where he will make friends and stab them. We have had in the West that kind of an enemy. I tell you it is a hard place to put an American soldier, in that climate in those jungles, contending with such a foe. It is a hard place, but they are doing it at the command of the United States. They have no option; they must go. They are soldiers of the United States, and they are compelled to go where this Government sends them. Is there no consideration for their situation?

I do not believe that the American people are going to take any stock in

THE GENERAL ABUSE OF THE ARMY.

They will condemn, as they always have done, any violation of the laws of war in acts of cruelty. They will call for justice to be administered in the usual way. But they will not try the United States Army, 6,000 miles away, on ex parte testimony, and the heat of debate here will not mislead the country.

The people will be sorry that in the United States Senate the Army, in which their friends and brothers and relatives are engaged, are indiscriminately denounced, although Senators on the gaged, are indiscriminately denounced, although senators on the other side may say they do not intend to denounce the Army. There is nothing the Army does that they do not denounce. The people have confidence in the Army. They always have had confidence in the Army. The Army in the Philippines ought to have the confidence and sympathy of the American people, because they are sent on the most arduous task that any soldiers of the United States were conveniented to falfall. United States were ever commanded to fulfill.

The people also have confidence in Judge Taft and his asso-

The people also have confidence in Judge Taft and his associates. They have borne a good character in this country. They are all men of high character and they are well known. The people are willing that they shall work out this problem, a problem which is the problem of the United States and not of any party. It must be done. The more general abuse is indulged in, the more general complaint there is without reason, the worse it will

be for the complainants.

THIS QUESTION OUGHT NOT TO BE A POLITICAL ISSUE.

It was not a political issue when we got the Philippines. It was not a political issue when we sent the army there. That was done by the vote of all. It was not a political issue when the mandates of Congress and of the country were carried out, and it is not a political issue as to how they shall manage it. The only political issue made by these proceedings is whether we will promise before we are able to perform and when we do not know that we shall

ever be able to perform such promise.

I believe that the strong hand of the United States must be placed behind the Filipinos to hold them up. It has got to be behind the citizens who are there to protect them. It has got to stand behind every man for the next fifty years if we carry out the obligation that we assumed when we ratified the treaty with Spain. When we undertook to protect the life and property of the for-eigners and to do justice to all men in those islands, we undertook an arduous task, it is true; but the nation is committed to it, and the United States never failed to perform any undertaking that it entered upon, and it must perform it now. It may be embarrassing; it may be difficult on account of the completion of the complaining at home—but our mission must be performed.

The Filipinos have friends here in the United States fighting their

the rimpnos have friends here in the United States igning their battles, and they are being taught that all they need do is to continue to assassinate and to continue their systems of treachery to achieve ultimate success. I say it is unjust to our soldiers, it is unjust to this country, to encourage an enemy in arms by promises. There ought not to be a party in this country that will make those promises, to involve soldiers in peril more than necessary, to involve the country in expense, and prolong the time when civil government can be established. The time will be pro-

BEYOND THE LIVES OF ANY OF THOSE NOW LIVING

if we continue to encourage the enemy to assassinate our soldiers and assassinate the helpless Filipinos who are our friends, if we continue to encourage in their opposition a race of men who in some of those islands have been pirates and robbers from time imme-

The United States has undertaken this task. It will build up the Philippine Archipelago. It will overcome all opposition. I warn my friends on the other side that there is no political gain in their attitude on this question. Every word they say against the Army will react in the hundred thousand ex-soldiers scattered over the country and the millions that sympathize with them, the millions that admire our Army, the millions that know the hardships that they are subjected to, the millions who feel aggrieved at anything that looks like an attack upon the Army or the policy which grew out of the war, the ratification of the treaty, and the ap-

which grew out of the war, the ratincation of the treaty, and the appropriations made to govern the country. I tell you that the people will uphold the Army.

This issue was submitted practically in the campaign of 1900. It was called imperialism. It did not avail. The people did not heed it. The people said, "We have planted our flag in the Philippine islands; we have undertaken to hold them and civilize them; we can not retreat; we are under obligations that we can not

ignore.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I believe the acquisition of those islands will

REDOUND TO THE BENEFIT OF THE UNITED STATES

and of the people thereof. It will make markets, it will create commerce, and we will civilize the people and do them good.

Where have the American people gone that they did not do good? Have they not done good from the Atlantic to the Pacific to the savages they found here? Did they not carry blessings to Florida? Did they not carry blessings to California and to New Mexico, and wherever they went? Does anybody doubt their ability to do it agent? ity to do it again?

The idea is absurd to talk about the Filipinos being fit for selfgovernment and that they will protect life and property when

they are every day assassinating their own fellow-citizens and

they are every day assassinating their own fellow-citizens and their own neighbors for showing friendliness to the United States. Do you think they will protect the property of those who have been friendly to us, or pretended to be friendly? No; they show a disposition directly the other way.

Now, there are many things in this bill that are very admirable; for example, the monetary system. I do not see how a better one could have been devised. I do not say this because it is silver, because that question is past, but the bill provides for a stable currency, for a regular supply of legal-tender money when not otherwise provided by law.

IT OPENS THE MINTS TO THE COINAGE OF SILVER.

They will get along well when they have plenty of money.

As to the silver question, I beg pardon for digressing enough to say a word. Some have intimated that I have changed my views upon the money question. Very far from it. Inever changed at all. Those who accuse me of it do not know anything about the money question. They accuse me, through their ignorance, of being in-consistent. The United States were using both gold and silver and had been from time immemorial, when some schemers demonetized silver. There was not gold enough for use as money. Hard times came and lasted for twenty years. Then the gold mines became productive, so that the gold supplied the place of both metals. There have been fourteen or fifteen hundred millions of new gold added to the stock we had on hand in the last six years.

So we have good times. Some of our friends, however, say that it is on account of the gold standard; that there is something in the material gold which makes it money. It is law of legal tender, not the kind of material from which it is made. Gold is no more money than beef, or pork, or flour, or any other commodity. It is the stamp of the Government which is the law that makes it money, and if we have enough good legal-tender money it does not make any difference of what material we make it.

Now, Aristotle explained that

MONEY IS THE CREATION OF LAW

twenty-two hundred years ago. Nobody has ever been able to confute what he said. The world thought for a long time that silver was money, without regard to law, but when they took the stamp of legal tender off it was only silver. The world then found it silver metal, not money. The legal-tender power of the government is all that makes money, whether it is printed on gold, silver, or paper.

Thus the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the law of Congress makes money. Thus the highest courts of Great Britain have decided. Thus every intelligent man ought to know. I do not believe that the use of any one metal or that the two metals are the best modes of ascertaining quantity. The general range of prices should regulate the quantity. The quantity of money in circulation should be sufficient to maintain the stability of prices, but it need not be made of any particular material. Of course the law makes it money. Take the law off of gold and you

Will see whether it is money or not.

I read a short time ago of a Secretary of the Treasury who went down to Richmond, Va., and talked to the bankers there and said that they had found a metal that was always of the same value. If a mountain of gold were discovered, you would see if it would be of the same value, and if gold would buy as much wheat as now. The output of gold shows that that is not the case. Putting out fourteen or fifteen hundred million dollars of gold has raised Gold is not worth as much as it was in 1896. Republican party on that question, because the scarcity of money was ruining the country. There was not money enough, and the millions were suffering under it. But when we got relief by the output of gold then I was not fool enough to follow up a dead

The issue of silver is dead, so far as the United States is con-

cerned, until

THE GOLD MINES GIVE OUT.

The time may come when we shall have the same trouble over again, because civilization has had this trouble from the foundation of the world, or as far back as history goes. When the mines were productive we had civilization, and when the mines became exhausted we had hard times and barbarism. During the dark ages the people had no mining, and even lost the art of separating gold and silver from the baser metals. There was no mining and no money; no civilization. A few men had the money, and the balance were slaves. This condition may come again, if the gold mines give out.

It looks now, from the prospect we have before us, that there will be gold enough for some time to come. That may be true for the next fifty years. I do not expect to see the issue again. No man can now go out and make a silver speech and get a decent hearing. I suppose the world will adhere to the use of gold for a while, but the time may come when gold will be abandoned. The discovery of a mountain of gold would cause the immediate abandonment of gold as a money metal.

No one commodity or two commodities will at all times bear the same numerical relation to all other commodities to be exchanged therewith. So long as metal money of any kind is coined without limit the equity of contracts will depend upon the accidents of mining. Price is the true guide, and when legislation shall provide a quantity of money clothed with legal-tender power which shall maintain stability of prices, a plunge into barbarism will not again occur when the mines fail.

Thus I wrote fifteen years ago. Anyone who will read what I have written will see that I have not been inconsistent. I have only said that silver is no better than gold, when we have gold enough. The only trouble with mankind is that there will not be enough. It is fluctuating. The idea that the equity of contracts should depend upon the accidents of mining is very hard on mankind.

THIS BILL IS BENEFICIAL TO THE MINERS.

It will make a larger market for silver. You want a larger market for silver just the same as you want a larger market for lead. The lead miner wants a larger market for lead. We want a larger market for silver whether we use it or not, because many of our people are engaged in mining silver. In mining copper, lead, and almost all metals it is a by-product, and you must mine silver

if you mine other metals.

To have this rise in the price of silver is very important to my State. This bill will help my people considerably because it will make an additional market for silver and raise the price to those engaged in that business. The goldites used to accuse us by saying that our only motive in advocating silver was to get a market for silver. That was my last motive. I wanted to get silver used as money for the benefit of my constituents, but I never argued the money question for that reason. I argued the money question because I believed that it was necessary to the happiness of the country that there should not be a shrinkage of the money vol-

ume, and misery everywhere. I was perfectly astonished when the Democratic party, in 1900, put the free coinage of silver in their platform, for the issue had been killed by the output of gold. There is nothing in following that forlorn hope. It is dead, and it will be a dead issue, and all money issues that have lived will be dead, for as long as we have the present output of gold we shall have good times. You talk about good times. It comes from more money. Never in the history of the world has there been a time when the volume of money was increasing that they did not have good times. Hume wrote was increasing that they did not have good times. Hume wrote over a hundred years ago that a country with less money, but with its volume increasing, was less miserable and more prosperous than another country with a larger volume of money which was decreasing. It is the decrease of the volume of the money which brings misery. There is nothing which afflicts mankind so much as a decrease in the volume of money.

The untold misery that was created by the decrease in the volume of money by the demonetization of silver will never be realized. The misery that graw out of it never can be told and I

The misery that grew out of it never can be told, and I hope it will not be repeated. I am sure it will not be as long as the gold mines continue. When they give out it may come. We do not know when. And then surely you will have the same thing over again. You will have all the miseries of the dark You will have the miseries of which we had a taste between 1873 and 1896.

Now, this provision in the bill gives the Filipinos a stable cur-

IT OPENS A MARKET FOR SILVER,

to which they are accustomed. It is a wise provision. are also provisions in the bill in regard to mining laws. are mines in the islands that our people want to work, and they will go there for that purpose, because they will go anywhere in the world for a mine. We have not only a mining law, but a the world for a mine. We have not only a mining law, but a law for opening the lands of the friars, and thus remove an evil against which Filipinos have been contending for years. They have complained of it as one of their greatest grievances, and the bill proposes to remove it.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me? I have been very much entertained in hearing the Senator return to a subject about which he has not spoken much of late. I simply would like to ask the Senator, for information, whether he still entertains the same opinion relative to the act of 1873 which I have so

tains the same opinion relative to the act of 1873 which I have so often heard him express in this Chamber?

Mr. STEWART. That act horrifies me more the oftener I think of it. I think it was the most unmitigated piece of cruelty ever perpetrated in any civilized country; whether ignorantly or willfully, it matters not.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator still think it was a crime?

Mr. STEWART. If it was knowingly done, it was an infamous crime. It may have been ignorantly done, but I am afraid some people knew what they were doing. I hope they did not, because if there is any punishment hereafter, if they knew what they were

doing they are certainly in danger. The act was a great calamity. It was a calamity that affected all civilization, and that calamity rested upon us until there came to our relief the output of gold.

So far as that is concerned this bill makes it possible for Amerso far as that is concerned this bill makes it possible for Americans to go there and get land, to get mines, to do business, and make contracts and know what they are doing. That is necessary. If you are going to have any civilization in that country you must have enterprise. It is enterprise and business that keeps civilization from sinking into savagery. It is an object lesson that will be afforded by Americans going there. Under this bill we can give them that object lesson.

The bill of the minority presents no object lesson. It presents no mining law. It presents no currency. It presents nothing

no mining law. It presents no currency. It presents nothing which will enlighten and raise the standard of those people. It simply tells them, "When you establish a stable government and give a guaranty (and they do not know what that means) to protect life and property and carry out our treaties with Spain we will let you go your own way." The minority propose in their bill to have England and a whole lot of other countries aid us in preventing any other country taking possession of it.

If that scheme is carried out.

ANARCHY WILL PREVAIL

just as it has for the last five hundred years. Without Spain they would have been at war all the time. It has been their business to rob each other and steal from the outside. That has been the business of those who live along the coast. Those in the interior are the sufferers. The people of Luzon and that territory have are the sunerers. The people of Luzon and that territory have always been a better people than those in Samar and the other islands farther south; but you offer them a promise that they shall have liberty, that they shall have independence when they accom-plish what it is utterly impossible for them to accomplish, and you and I know it.

They can not accomplish it without the protecting hand of the nited States. Would the Seminoles have established a govern-United States. ment in Florida, maintained law and order, if they had been let alone and freed from Spain? Would the people of New Mexico have been able to establish a stable government without our aid, among whom you find now intelligent men able to take their place in any legislative assembly? You find them that way after fifty years of example, living in a civilized country, being protected, and you see what the effect will be on them. I have visited the legislature of New Mexico at different times in the last forty The change there is marvelous, and so it will be in the Philippines. All you want is to restrain them until you can fur-

nish them an object lesson.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.
Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if he is quite sure that New Mexico is about to be a State? I should like to know that myself, if he can give me any assurance of it.

Mr. STEWART. Undoubtedly the Senator would be pleased

to have it become a State.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.
Mr. STEWART. The most numerous branch of the National
Legislature here has passed an act to admit it. It has passed Mr. TELLER. I know it.

Mr. STEWART. The lower House has not been more liberal

than the Senate in that regard. It will undoubtedly be passed

here, I presume.

Mr. BACON. The Nicaragua Canal bill has passed the other House twice, but that affords no guarantee that it will come to a

Mr. STEWART. The Nicaragua Canal bill has some conditions surrounding it that are peculiar, and which I have not time to

Mr. TILLMAN. What about the Cuban reciprocity bill? That bill, giving justice to the Cubans, has passed the House, too.
Mr. STEWART. That was sent here to be digested. It was not passed as they want it. We will probably digest it. We are able to do that; but I do not think we have ever turned down a State the other House was willing to admit. I do not believe it ever has been done. The States have been admitted from here. The Senate has been much more liberal in admitting new States than the House.

I noticed some slurs against Nevada in the House when the Arizona bill was under consideration and nobody defended the State there. I think such slurs gratuitous. It was said they did not want any more Nevadas admitted. But they have forgotten, or they do not keep the run of the history of the times.

NEVADA IS GROWING VERY RAPIDLY

She has a great many good mines now; more, in fact, than any other State in the Union. A wonderful progress exists there in

the way of railroad building, mining, agriculture, etc. We have plenty of population, if quality is taken in consideration.

We have always had enough population to get along pretty well, for what we lacked in numbers we made up in quality. We have always been ready to meet our neighbors on that score. We never mourned about the lack of population, because we knew we had great resources which eventually would bring population. Nevada is going to be one of the foremost States in the American Union, and I hope our friends will not spend any more time sympathizing with Nevada. We have plenty of prosperity in Nevada now, and we do not want sympathy. When you have prosperity you do not want sympathy.

I have, however, been led off from what I was saying. I say that it is education and business which Americans take with them which elevate the people. That was the case in California. We took possession of that country, and the natives who were there now furnish members of the State legislature, governors, judges, and Representatives in Congress.

Moving has had an object lesson and furnished her great man

Mexico has had an object lesson and furnished her great man, Diaz, one of the most remarkable men whom this hemisphere has produced. He has brought order out of chaos. He has intro-duced railroads, telegraphs, and all the paraphernalia of modern civilization into that country. The great mass of the Mexican people have advanced more in the last twenty years than they did from the time of the discovery of America until

THE TIME WHEN DIAZ WAS PLACED IN CONTROL.

The people of the Philippine Islands must have object lessons. Give them an opportunity to see what can be done by enterprise, by business, by railroads, by telegraphs, and let them become engaged in business enterprises which will occupy their attention, and they will rapidly advance.

But here in the substitute of the minority it is not proposed to do anything for the Filipinos; it is not proposed that there shall be any building of railroads or telegraphs for them; it is not proposed to aid them by opening up their mines or giving them opportunities for employment. They know nothing about government; they know nothing about establishing a form of government that will protect life and property and guarantee to carry out the obligations of the United States which we assumed under the treaty with Spain or to protect the lives of foreigners and the lives of their own citizens.

We know the Filipinos alone and unaided can not do it in a hundred years. We will have to keep our hands on them. We have undertaken before the world to develop the Archipelago, to maintain law and order there, to give those people an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of our civilization, and the world an opportunity to trade without fear of being molested. We have pledged ourselves to perform certain obligations to the world and to Spain, and both Houses of Congress have made appropriations for that purpose. The treaty requires it. It is our Government which is engaged in this work. Now, shall we say stop, stop; throw away all that has been accomplished, and, having driven

Spain out, shall we let anarchy prevail there? Some say we should establish a protectorate. ment is not going to protect governments away off in the Orient. When we undertake to set up a protectorate in the Orient other countries will have something to say about it. We have

MAINTAINED THE MONROE DOCTRINE

on this continent because it is within the sphere of our influence, and because we are interested in maintaining it here.

The rest of the world respects it here because we have some power to enforce our demands, but when we undertake to say that the nations of the world shall not interfere with the Philippine Islands we must have a Navy to enforce that position which will be equal to the navies of all the world. There can be no protectorate of that kind. We must either go forward and accomplish what we have undertaken to do, establish law and order, give the Filipinos good government, give them an opportunity to enjoy the fruits of liberty, as all other countries do—we must either do that, or acknowledge ignominious defeat and dis-

The American people are not prepared for that. They are not going to take any step backward; they never have taken a step backward, and they are not going to do it now. Any man who predicates his hope upon public sentiment changing will find himself sadly mistaken. There may be cruelties perpetrated by the army in the Philippines, but there will be punishment. When was it that the American people could not punish crime—could not restrain our soldiers? We have always done it, and will continue to do so.

If cruelties have been perpetrated in the Philippine Islands, let the offenders be tried where the offenses were committed and where the facts exist; but do not try the American Army, fighting in the Philippines, 6,000 miles away, on ex parte testimony. It is not a fair trial, and the American people are not satisfied with that kind of a trial. They do not want

THEIR BROTHERS AND THEIR SONS

tried where they can not be heard, and they do not believe that the American Government is going to do any great wrong. It never has. It never has violated the principles of good government.

Our country has had an onward progress for more than one hundred years. It may make mistakes, but they will be little ones, not the great mistake of surrendering our trust. Perhaps we ought not to have undertaken the trust, but we have accepted it by the voice of the whole American people, and by both Houses of Congress. The war was prosecuted; we were victorious; the of Congress. treaty was ratified; appropriations were made; and, as I said be-

fore, we have undertaken to establish good government in the islands, and we can not retreat. We will not promise to retreat. Promises are idle now. Let the work we started out to do be done, and then it will be time enough to see what we shall do There will be as wise men in Congress then as there are I have faith in coming Congresses. When you say you must provide for the contingencies that may happen hereafter, it is a declaration that we do not believe that the Congresses that are to follow will be as patriotic and as intelligent as are we. If that were so, that would be the end of the Republic.

THE REPUBLIC CAN NOT LIVE

unless we continue to have intelligent and patriotic members of the two Houses of Congress. You will have them even more intelligent fifty years from now, or even twenty years from now, than they are to-day. Whenever good government is estab-lished in these islands they will know whether they can trust the Filipinos or not. But one thing is certain: The American people will never fail to discharge the obligations that they have taken upon themselves in that treaty, and taken with the consent of all

More than that, the action is sanctified by the blood of hundreds of the best American citizens who ever lived. Many of our brave boys have offered up their lives in those far-away islands. Every neighborhood from which a boy has gone to the Philippines and lost his life over there feels an interest in this question. Every patriotic man feels the obligations that we have assumed, and he will not ask this Government to lower the flag. Where the American flag is planted and has been watered by the blood of brave men, it will stay and never be pulled down. Do not intimate such a thing.

The party that intimates

THE PULLING DOWN OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

under the circumstances in which it is floating in the Philippines will be repudiated by the American people. I hope no one will make such a suggestion. Some Senators on the other side have been already apologizing for such expressions, and I am glad to hear it.

Our Army should be free from such attacks as we have heard here. If orders have been issued like those which General Smith is said to have issued, which are criminal, let those who promulgate them be tried by courts-martial. The Army is abundantly able to take care of itself and its honor. It will do what is right. Fear not.

I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I think there has been too much said already; but before anything was said, before a witness was examined, we knew what our duty was; we knew that we were bound to give the Filipinos a government. We must go forward in that work. We have undertaken it, and we can not turn back, We did not need evidence to know that. We might take evidence in regard to the form of the government we should establish, in regard to the character of the mining, currency, and other laws. We should have confined our investiwe should establish, if regard to the character of the mining, currency, and other laws. We should have confined our investigations to those things. Nobody proposes to change the civil government and nobody proposes to abolish military rule there. That is not proposed either in the bill of the majority or in the substitute offered by the minority.

The plan of the majority is to go on until

THE FILIPINOS HAVE ESTABLISHED A GOVERNMENT

which can perform all the obligations which we have assumed in those islands. Why embarrass them by finding fault now? There is nothing that can be truly said against Governor Taft. A better man could not be selected in any part of the world. How can the situation be benefited or improved? Suggestions for the improvement of the bill are in order, but suggestions that the American flag shall be hauled down in the Philippines under these circumstances will be repudiated by all patriotic men, North and South. It is not a ladder on which to climb into

Senators talk about giving up the Philippines and abandoning our trust. It would be a disgrace in the eyes of the world for us to do so. I hope that such an issue as that will not be presented to the American people even if the Senators of the minority advocate it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Before the Senator takes his seat, will he not be kind enough to give us some information or light on the questions presented in sections 79 and 80 of this bill?

Mr. STEWART. What is the character of the sections to

which the Senator refers?
Mr. TILLMAN. I will read them. Section 79 provides:

SEC. 79. That the said Philippine government is authorized to coin a silver dollar, which shall contain 416 grains of standard silver, and the standard of said silver coins shall be such that of 1,000 parts by weight 900 shall be of pure metal and 100 of alloy, and the alloy shall be of copper. And upon the said silver dollar there shall be devices and inscriptions to be prescribed by the government of the Philippine Islands, with the approval of the Secretary of War of the United States, which devices and inscriptions shall express or symbolize the sovereignty of the United States and that it is a coin of the Philippine Islands, together with the denomination of the coin expressed in English, Filipino, and Chinese characters, and the date of its coinage.

Then section 80 provides for the deposit of bullion, the same as we do at our own mints for gold. I should like to ask the Senator to tell us while we are putting this over there, if it is a good thing, why do we not put it here? The Senator has just said that he has not changed his views. This is a very cloudy subject to me, and I can not see why we should want to give a blessing to the Filinger of the first of it appeals and the second results of the senator will pinos and not get a little of it ourselves. I hope the Senator will

pinos and not get a little of it ourselves. I hope the Senator will give us some light on that subject.

Mr. STEWART. I will do so. That is a very easy thing to do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am in the dark, and of course I can get light from the Senator from Nevada in a great many directions.

Mr. STEWART. You can get light in this direction if you will pay attention. There is no doubt about that.

The dollar provided for in the section just reed is conjugant to

The dollar provided for in the section just read is equivalent to the Mexican dollar. It is about the same weight I believe, as the Mexican dollar. The Mexican dollar is circulating throughout the Orient, and has been so circulating almost from time immemorial. The Orientals know exactly its value. The dollar memorial. The Orientals know exactly its value. The dollar that we allow the Filipinos to coin will be of the same value, and they will soon get accustomed to using it. It will make a market for silver, and besides that it will give them a stable coin. They are not yet prepared for paper money, and they can not have gold there because they can not possibly have a gold circulation. They could not get gold in sufficiently small denominations; and if you introduced gold, you would change the entire customs of the people. They have been using the Mexican dollar for a long time and know all about it.

When you give them the coin proposed in the pending bill

When you give them the coin proposed in the pending bill you will be conforming to the customs there and

FURNISHING THEM A STABLE CURRENCY,

which, I think, is very wise, and I congratulate the committee on the adoption of that provision in the bill. It will be beneficial in the way of affording a market for silver, and will give those people, as I have said, a stable currency of the kind that they have been in the habit of using. It is a currency with which they can trade with China, and it will be perfectly understood both by them and by their neighbors, because the Mexican dollar has been used there from time immemorial, and they understand its

weight and fineness as well as we do.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir.
Mr. CARMACK. I should like to ask the Senator how he thinks it will affect the trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands to have the silver standard over there and

have the gold standard here?

Mr. STEWART. Just as it affects the trade between the United States and China to-day; just as it affects the trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands to-day. It is the same standard they now have.

Mr. LODGE. And with Mexico. Mr. STEWART. They have the same standard, the silver

standard, in the Orient and in Mexico, with whom we trade.

Mr. CARMACK. The point on which I wished to get the Senator's statement was this, whether or not it would tend to increase the trade between the United States and the Philippines or facilitate commercial intercourse between the two countries to assimi-

tate commercial intercourse between the two countries to assimilate their monetary systems?

Mr. STEWART. The committee have thought it best to let them have this monetary system. I have often explained that the country having the cheaper money has the advantage in trade with countries having dearer money. India had a great advantage in that respect over England. They almost destroyed the manufactures of England, because they manufactured with silver and then sold their products in England for gold, thus competing with England; but now all Europe has adopted the gold standard.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada vield to the Senator from Tennessee?

yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.
Mr. CARMACK. That was not the point to which I was directing the attention of the Senator. As I understand it, India hav-Mr. STEWART. Mr. CARMACK. ing a silver standard, the advantage in trade between India and Great Britain has been with India.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. CARMACK. And that Great Britain has suffered very largely because of that fact?

Mr. STEWART. Prices have been regulated by fixing the gold

value of silver.

Mr. CARMACK. The point to which I was trying to direct the attention of the Senator was, Will not the same result occur from our relation with the Philippines? If they have the silver standard and if this country has the gold standard, will that not be a standard and if this country has the gold standard, will that not be provided by the provided standard. tend to destroy trade between the United States and the Philippines, as it has destroyed trade between Great Britain and India?

Mr. STEWART. It will not have the same effect on our trade with the Philippines as in trade between Great Britain and India.

The wages of labor did not go up with inflated prices. India could manufacture more cheaply than it could be done in England,

and that hurt England.

THERE IS NO IMMEDIATE DANGER

of that happening in the Philippines, because they are not a manufacturing people. They trade in raw materials, and so it makes no difference; but where they have cheaper money they have the advantage in manufacturing over a country which has to manu-

facture with dearer money.

A great commotion was created in England on account of the great advantage free silver gave India over the mother country. Meetings were called there to enter protest, and they have been trying to fix the standard by legislation. They first tried putting India on a gold standard but they could not do that. Then they India on a gold standard, but they could not do that. Then they undertook to keep the value of the rupee permanent, so as to prevent fluctuation. They have it now so that the fluctuation is not so great as formerly. They have equalized it by various devices; but silver money will afford no particular advantage in the Philippines, or it will amount to nothing, because they are not a manufacturing country, and their labor is not organized.

If they should become a manufacturing country, as China might become a manufacturing country, and there were enough of them, it would affect us just the same as England was affected. I do not think the Filipinos will enter into manufactures until

I do not think the Filipinos will enter into manufactures until they get an established government, a government that can give guaranties, and I do not expect to live to see that done.

Mr. CARMACK. Does the Senator think that this legislation

will encourage manufacturing in the Philippines as similar legislation did in India?

Mr. STEWART. It will, and to a certain extent I should like

to see it.

Mr. CARMACK. And at our expense?
Mr. STEWART. I do not think there will be enough of it to be of much expense to us. I think that is too remote a contin-

gency to contemplate.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.
Mr. RAWLINS. I understand the Senator to have said that when the American flag is once raised anywhere in territories it is never proper to take it down?

Mr. STEWART. No; I did not say that.

No; I did not say that. That it "must stay put?" I did not say that. Mr. RAWLINS.

Mr. STEWART.

Mr. RAWLINS. That we can not withdraw in honor from any territory that has come into our possession?

Mr. STEWART. I did not say that. Mr. RAWLINS. That it would be a national disgrace to with-

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I think it would.
Mr. RAWLINS. Now I have got the point of the Senator, that it is unpatriotic to suggest such a thing?
Mr. RAWLINS. That is the position the Senator took?
Mr. RAWLINS. That is the position the Senator took?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.
Mr. RAWLINS. That is the position the Senator took?
Mr. STEWART. Yes; I think it is.
Mr. RAWLINS. Now, I want to invite the attention of the Senator to this language employed by General Grant in his Memoirs. I read from volume 1, page 53:

For myself I was bitterly opposed to the measure-

That is, to the Mexican war-

and to this day regard the war which resulted as one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation. It was an instance of a republic following the bad example of European monarchies in not consider-ing justice in their desire to acquire additional territory.

I now read from page 56—— Mr. STEWART. Are you going to read the whole book?

Mr. RAWLINS. No; but I want to read this language of General Grant. He says:

It is to the credit of the American nation, however, that after conquering Mexico, and while practically holding the country in our possession, so that we could have retained the whole of it, or made any terms we chose, we paid a round sum for the additional territory taken—more than it was worth, or was likely to be, to Mexico. To us it was an empire and of incalculable value; but it might have been obtained by other means. The Southern rebellion was largely the outgrowth of the Mexican war. Nations, like individuals, are punished for their transgressions. We got our punishment in the most sanguinary and expensive war of modern times.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada decline to yield further to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STEWART. I should like to know what question the Sen-

ator is going to predicate on what he has just read?

Mr. RAWLINS. If the Senator will be patient for just a mo-

Mr. STEWART. Very well.
Mr. RAWLINS. After we had conquered Mexico and it was absolutely in our possession—which can not be said of the Philippine Islands—in June of the year to which the memoirs of this distinguished General refer, our flag was taken down and the troops of this great nation withdrawn. I want to ask whether or not the Senator approves of that?

Mr. STEWART. I approve of just what was done. No doubt

about that.

Mr. RAWLINS. Then the Senator is not-

I want to say my own say. I have not said Mr. STEWART. anything of that kind.

Mr. SPOONER. Let the Senator draw the parallel.
Mr. STEWART. Yes; let him explain the parallel. There is
no parallel whatever in the two cases. I said that where our flag
was planted with the pledge to keep it there, where we undertook to carry out obligations, and where it was sanctified by the blood

of our soldiers, there it would stay.

In the Mexican war we overran that country and could have taken it all, as General Grant says, but we did not see fit to do We paid Mexico a large amount of money and took only a part of the country that was then of no use to her. After we had done that, after the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo had been nad done that, after the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo had been ratified, and we had undertaken to protect the rights of citizens, native and foreign in that country—after we had undertaken that, to pull down our flag would have been a disgrace. That would have been a parallel. It would be like pulling down our flag in California after it was planted there, after the treaty had been made and the American people were emigrating to that part of the country. The pledge of the nation was that they should stay there as citizens and be protected. That would be a parallel.

WE CONQUERED SPAIN,

we took the Philippines, and we pledged ourselves in the treaty with Spain to maintain law and order in the Islands, to pre-serve the rights of Spain, and to protect the rights of foreigners there. We undertook this before all the world, and to take down the flag now, I say, would be a disgrace. Where the flag is planted with obligations to maintain it in the treaty and in the laws and in the blood of our soldiers it will stay there. American people will never turn their backs upon such obliga-

Now, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee one question. I ask if he approves of that portion of the bill providing

for the coinage of silver in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. CARMACK. I think I have not approved of any part of the bill that I have found yet; but so far as that particular part of it is concerned, I make no objection to it. I was simply asking the opinion of the Senator from Nevada as an expert on this question. On this question I should like to have some information from the Senator, or have him express his views upon it.

Mr. STEWART. All right.

Mr. CARMACK. I do not say that I am opposed to that particular feature of the bill at all. On the contrary, I am inclined to think that it would be wrong for this country to undertake to change the monetary conditions which prevail there now.

change the monetary conditions which prevail there now. have not asked the question of the Senator with a view of opposing that feature of the bill. I thought he had made a study of this question and was an expert; and so I wanted to hear from him some explanation in regard to it.

Mr. STEWART. That is all right. I do not think any Senator here is opposed to that feature of the bill, on either side of the Chamber; and I do not think there is any serious objection to the mining feature or the land feature of the bill, or to buying out and getting rid of the friars. I do not think there is any serious objection to doing what the Filipinos want to do in excluding the

Chinese The Filipinos have sent their protest here, saying that they do not want the Chinese; and we know that that feeling exists there. We have done as they desired in that respect, and we

propose to do as they desire in respect to the friars' lands. We have relieved them from that oppression. We have relieved them from many others. We have a great work to accomplish in the islands, and there is no doubt that we will accomplish it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I wish to say that he has not finished elucidating the silver

phase of this bill at all.

Mr. STEWART. Go on and ask more questions, then. Mr. TILLMAN. When the Senator used to wax eloquent and I was a pupil under his tuition here in the glories of free silver, it seems to me that I recall that the party generally with which he is now affiliated used to oppose our contention on this side, and his contention, with the argument that to have the United States on a silver basis and the balance of the world—that is, the European world—on a gold basis, would interfere with the exchanges to such an extent that we would be ham-pered in our commercial relations and intercourse with Europe, and that we could not possibly endure such a thing. Now the Senator says that the free coinage of silver and a silver basis in the Philippines will not interfere in the slightest with the exchanges between the United States and our colonies. I should like to have the Senator give us a little light upon the change of front, or the change of heart, or the change of conditions through which his mind has reached this conclusion.

Mr. STEWART. Give me an opportunity and I will do it with pleasure. All I want is an opportunity. I have had no change of heart, but there has been a change of conditions. I have contended in every speech that if this country would have free silver

it would break Europe if they would not follow us.

Mr. TILLMAN. And now you want the Filipinos to break us. Mr. STEWART. They are not big enough to do that. If they were as big as we are, I should be very much afraid of them. If they were a manufacturing country I should be afraid to give them free coinage, but they are not. They would have the same experience in that regard as India had.

A good many of my friends on the other side did not understand my position at all. I have been misunderstood, but I thought my friend from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] did understand me on that subject. My views are the same to-day as they have ever been, but now conditions have changed. We have gold enough to furnish a sufficient volume of money, and we

have good times, and I want to let well enough alone.

Accommodating the Filipinos with a suitable currency in silver, which they have always had, without any change, is not going to injure us materially unless they become a great manufacturing country; then it will be time to change. There may be a difference in the output of gold by that time. Things may change as rapidly as other issues that are presented, but I will understand them when they arise, because I understand the question. I knew when the silver question was dead, and I did not advocate putting it in any platform. I knew when it was dead and realized that it would be buried until the present large output of gold ceased.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. One of the arguments which used to be made with reference to the effect of the silver standard in the silver countries was that it operated as a bounty upon exports.

countries was that it operated as a bounty upon exports.

Mr. STEWART. It did.

Mr. CARMACK. Does the Senator think it will have that effect in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I think it will to some extent. All Asia has an advantage in being on the silver standard. It is held down by the Western world. They have not the advantages they had before we attained plenty of gold. When we were hard up for money they had a great advantage, and India prospered as she never had prospered.

She sprang forward; she was able to supply the markets in the

She sprang forward; she was able to supply the markets in the Orient, and the weavers and manufacturers of various kinds held meetings and they sent here volumes of protests against it, which I read before the Senate. They could not stand the competition that occurred; but now if the Orient stands by silver and we stand by gold and gold happens to be scarcer than silver, you will feel it. But England has tied the hands of India, so that India can not do much harm.

Mr. CARMACK. The point I wished to make in that connection was: If the silver standard in the Philippines operates as a bounty upon exports we will be in the position of putting up a tariff in the United States against sugar, for instance, from the Philippines, and at the same time, by our monetary policy, giving

a bounty upon sugar.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, well, that is to be temporary. We shall not have a tariff long; and they are not going to manufacture enough to hurt us. It is magnifying the thing too much to think

that they are going to hurt us in that way.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is one other question I should like to

ask before the Senator takes his seat. I notice in the section just

which devices and inscriptions shall express or symbolize the sovereignty of the United States and that it is a coin of the Philippine Islands, together with the denomination of the coin expressed in English, Filipino, and Chinese characters, and the date of its coinage.

Will the Senator tell me what "Filipino" is in that sense? I do not recall who it was, but I thought some one who was arguing against the possibility of any government by the Philippine people among themselves, or any cooperation because of the various nationalities and tribes and languages which we all know exist there, stated that there was no such thing as a Filipino language; but it seems that the chairman of the committee, or the committee, or some one, has discovered a Filipino language, and if the Senator has received that information from the source from

which I suppose the committee got it I would like to have it.

Mr. STEWART. I suppose the committee thought as the Filipinos might have some kinds of characters there, it would be natural to use them, and if they have, all right. It will do no harm to have a device on the coin. I think that is a discussion between tweedledee and tweedledem, and tweedledee may have the advantage. I do not know whether the inscription is neces-

the advantage. I do not know whether the inscription is necessary or not, but it is well enough. I have never contended that they did not have a language.

Mr. ALLISON. They have many languages, and in many Mr. STEWART. They have many languages, and in many tribes a jargon of languages, as was the case among the Indians. The Indians all had languages here, but one tribe could not understand another. There are some very highly educated people in the Philippine Islands, but they have never been able to sustain any kind of government. Perhaps Spain would not allow them to do so. They have had no experience in government. They know nothing about government at all.

In Samar and in that locality they were engaged in the business of piracy for some three or four hundred years, and when Magellan discovered the island they killed him and his followers by treachery. They have undoubtedly had a language. The pirates had a language, but what of that?

That is not material. Most of the tribes can understand them-

selves. Sometimes they can not understand their neighbors. Nobody has ever contended that they have not some kind of language. You will find that everywhere. There are no people who have not some kind of language and these people un-I do not think the fact that you try to stamp doubtedly have. on the coin in the Filipino language some marks that they understand will do any harm.

I do not know whether the silver coin will be a success or not. The United States have tried to accommodate the Filipinos all they can, but the great accommodation is giving them a standard coin and giving them full value. If money is less valuable than bullion it will be regulated by its value, so far as the outside world is concerned in trade. It will be regulated by its bullion value in trade with the United States, as we have to regulate it in trading with all Oriental countries, as Europe has to do, except in India, where England is arbitrarily trying to fix the ratio to make the value of the rupee permanent. It will have to be regulated by its bullion value. I know Japan made a great mistake in adopting the gold standard when she did. She had a great advantage over the rest of the world under the silver standard.

Mr. TELLER. Everybody knows that.
Mr. STEWART. Everybody knows Japan made a great mistake. Her statesmen were going forward with marvelous speed.
They had all the advantages in their favor because they were a manufacturing country, but they have given that up, and so they do not enjoy that advantage now. There would be no special advantage to the Filipinos in trade with us until they became a manufacturing country.

Then it will be an advantage.

facturing country.
Mr. CARMACK.
Mr. STEWART. It is not a producing country of any kind. Mr. STEWART. No; they produce nothing but anarchy, and they are prolific in that and always have been. They produce robbers at sea and anarchy on land, and they have shown no disposition to produce anything else; but we will teach them, as we have taught the Mexicans, and as we have taught the Spaniards in Florida, and as we have taught people everywhere

we have gone what good government is.

We will teach them by our enterprise, by our example, how to be civilized. We will teach them by our government. We will teach them by showing them we can administer justice and that we can protect life and property. It is a lesson they need. It is a lesson we undertake to give them. It may be expensive to us, but it will certainly be beneficial to them. It would be more expensive not to do it, by losing our standing and character among the nations of the world in backing down from obligations and the property of the standard terms of the standard te tions we have undertaken.

How sensitive the people of the United States are about their character, about their honor! See what we have done with Cuba.

After the millions of money spent and the lives lost in procuring the liberty of the Cubans, we consented to give them their in-dependence. See what the word of the United States is worth! Keeping that pledge makes us admired by all the world. It is a higher plane than that upon which other nations have stood.

IT MAKES THE WHOLE WORLD ADMIRE AND RESPECT US, and the keeping of our pledge to establish law and order and protect life and property in the Philippines will make us further respected. The United States can not do a dishonorable thing. The people are proud, prosperous, progressive, and the world admires the strict honor with which we keep all our obligations. We have these obligations resting upon us. Whether or not we regret it, makes no difference.

Many men regret that we agreed to give up Cuba, but what American would say, after we made the pledge, that we should

not redeem the pledge?

What American dares suggest the violation of one pledge that this great Government has ever made? And if there is any solemn pledge it has ever made, then the pledge to establish law and order and to protect life and property of natives and foreigners alike in the Philippines made by this Government in the treaty with Spain is a solemn one. It has been carried out with fidelity, and will continue so to the end. We would blush to say that and will continue so to the end. We would blush to say that
this great Government had undertaken to do what it can not
accomplish. We are not going to blush. It is going to be done,
and we will all be proud of it.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator a question.
Mr. STEWART. Certainly.
Mr. TELLER. I understood the Senator to say he approved of
the least provision. I want to know if he approved to the least provision.

the land provision. I want to know if he approves of the provision which allows corporations to have 5,000 acres of land?

Mr. STEWART. That quantity may be a little excessive.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator a further question, as he has some acquaintance with the Tropics. I am not asking this for the purpose of criticising the bill, but to see if we can not arrive at something proper. I ask him whether 160 acres is not more than ought to be given to an individual in tropical countries, where such different conditions prevail from those that exist here; whether that is not too much? What does the Senator think about it?

Mr. STEWART. One hundred and sixty acres in a tropical country is probably as much as four times that amount would be

in a northern climate.

Mr. TELLER. Even more than that. Mr. STEWART. Yes; because a very small piece of land there will produce enormously. I have been in the Tropics and have seen the production, and it is perfectly astonishing what they can produce of their products, either sugar or tobacco or anything that will grow there. It grows very luxuriantly, but it requires a good deal of labor to attend to it, unless it be sugar cane. That grows naturally in many places, and bananas also grow naturally; but the Tropics are enormously productive. The digging of the but the Tropics are enormously productive. The digging of the soil is miasmatic and unhealthy, but the soil is wonderfully pro-

ductive. I think 160 acres is enough.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I merely wish to call the attention of the committee for a moment to a provision of the bill. I am not going to make a speech, but I think it is one of the deam not going to make a speech, but I think it is one of the defects of the measure. I think to give 160 acres in the Philippines is more than to give every settler in the United States a section of land; that is, it is more in proportion. The holdings in all the Tropics are small. I wish to read just a brief statement by Sir George Baden-Powell and Sir William Crossman in a report of the royal commission, made perhaps a couple of years ago in reference to Jamaica, a British island. They estimate that thirty days' labor on an acre of good land in Jamaica will, in addition to providing a family with food for a year, yield a surplus available in the market of from £10 to £30.

That is the statement made as to 1 acre of good Jamaica land, that it will support a family and produce salable products of the value of from £10 to £30—from \$50 to \$150—in addition. That, of course, we know has been one of the reasons why the tropical people have stood still in their civilization. It is so easy

to live that they do not exert themselves.

Jamaica is not a richer country than the Philippines, in great part. Of course, the mountains of Jamaica would not probably produce that much. Neither would the mountains of the Philippines; but there is a great quantity of good land in the Philippine Islands, and no man there can cultivate 160 acres. I should suppose that 10 acres there would be equal to 160 acres, certainly, on our farms.

The language of the bill, I think, is "not ex-Mr. LODGE.

ceeding 160 acres."

Mr. TELLER. I know; but I think we ought to limit it.

Mr. LODGE. I was going to ask the Senator what he thinks would be a proper limit. I see clearly the force of his objection.

Mr. TELLER. I think 10 acres are enough for any holding over there, as near as I can learn. There may be some land of which they should be allowed more, because it may not be all arable land in the mountains.

Mr. LODGE. We took the usual American amount.
Mr. TELLER. I will simply say to the committee that it seems to me a very large discretion ought to be given to the authorities over there in the matter, but the amount should still be fixed so as not to exceed a limited number of acres—40 acres, or something like that

Mr. LODGE. I am not perfectly sure, as I am speaking from memory, but I think the Commission suggested 40 acres as the

Mr. TELLER. I do not remember anything about it.
Mr. LODGE. I think those are the figures they suggested.
Mr. TELLER. Any native who has 40 acres of good land would be very rich; that is, his ability to get a living would be very well provided for. I believe there ought to be some amendment with

reference to that. Mr. LODGE. I am inclined to think it would be better to re-

duce the limit myself.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the limit in the bill? Mr. LODGE. One hundred and sixty acres.

Mr. TELLER. One hundred and sixty acres. I think that is

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to interrupt him?
Mr. LODGE. Certainly.
Mr. HANSBROUGH. I suggest to the Senator from Massa-

chusetts that the homestead should be limited to 40 acres, so as to conform to the provisions that are in vogue in the Department here, and that the provision in regard to 5,000 acres for corporations should be reduced to about 500, in order to conform to the law as it exists in Porto Rico. I simply offer that as a suggestion.

I will say to the Senator that I think the sug-Mr. LODGE. gestion in regard to the limitation of the amount of one holding

of land is a very judicious one. I am inclined to think the committee put too high a limit on the amount.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is, on the individual holdings.

Mr. LODGE. On the individual holdings. The matter of corporations is a matter that the committee should consider very carefully as to whether there should be any change made

While I am on the floor, Mr. President, I want to say a single word about the coinage provisions. From the questions asked by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] it seemed to me there was some misapprehension about them. We have made no change in the standard of the Philippine Islands. Their standard is a silver standard, with the free coinage of the Mexican dollar that is, the Mexican dollar can be imported there in any amount, and the Mexican dollar is the unit of their coinage. There are about 6,000,000 Spanish-Filipino dollars, as they are called, coined some time ago by Spain, which are of an inferior fineness and there-foreincapable of export. They had there a subsidiary coinage con-sisting of Spanish coins, both silver and copper. Those subsid-iary coins, being Spanish, had a larger value in Spain than they had in the Philippine Islands, and were practically all drained out

back to Spain, so that the islands are in great need of a subsidiary coinage, both of silver and copper. That the bill provides.

Now, all we attempt to do in this bill is to maintain the existing standard—to substitute for the Mexican dollar, which is of inferior coinage and many of which are greatly worn, a finely minted American-Filipino dollar, coined at our own mint. The suggestion of that dollar is taken from what is known as the English-Bombay dollar, which was coined by England for use in suggestion of that dollar is taken from what is known as the English-Bombay dollar, which was coined by England for use in the Straits Settlements and Hongkong and Singapore, which are all silver-using cities and countries. The English dollar, well coined, passes by tael, as a dollar coined by us would undoubtedly do, whereas the Mexican dollar is so inferior in coinage and much

of it is so much worn that it passes only by weight.

The coinage of the Bombay dollar was so successful for the Chinese trade that in the six years—I think it is six years—England has been coining it she has coined 110,000,000, and those have all, or the great mass of them, made their way into China and have been used in the trade with that country with great ad-

vantage to English commerce.

The committee felt, first, that it was unwise at this time to suddenly change the money standard to-which the people of those islands had always been accustomed; that it would involve a islands had always been accustomed; that it would involve a great alteration in prices and wages, and would be attended with all the risks and perils with which the change of a money standard is always attended. They also felt that it was absolutely necessary to supply the islands with a good subsidiary coinage, about which I think there is no dispute, and it seemed to them it was equally necessary to give them a good silver dol-

lar, and that we might as well replace the Mexican dollar with the American dollar, which could be used in the oriental trade

in China like the Bombay dollar.

Therefore, taking the Bombay dollar as a type of what was wanted, the committee provided for the impression to be made upon it and the inscription after the manner of the British order-in-council for the Bombay dollar. That order-in-council provided that there should be on the reverse of the dollar the statement in China Bombay dollar. Chinese, English, and Malay of the value of the coin, together with a Chinese device in the center. That enabled the coin to circulate throughout the Orient. There are, of course, many Malay dialects in the Straits Settlements for which this dollar was primarily coined, just as there are very many dialects in the Philippine Islands; and using the term "Filipino" is as vague as using the term "Malay" in the British order-in-council. The intention was, however, merely to get some sign or device which would be as nearly as possible comprehensive to the people of the islands.

The Chinese inscription of course was with a view to the use of these dollars in the Empire of China, where they will undoubtedly go in considerable quantities as trade progresses, and the committee felt that in this way they would not only give the Philippine Islands the coins which they now need very much, but that they would establish there a dollar which would be of great advantage to American commerce in the Orient.

The other plan was to substitute a modified form of the gold standard. I say a modified form because it provided for the standard. I say a modified form because it provided for the coinage of the peso, or Filipino dollar, which would be under weight and of inferior fineness, so that it would not leave the islands. It may be in the future desirable to put the Philippine Islands upon the gold standard, but the committee were very clear that that time had not yet arrived, and that it would be a mistake at the present time to attempt it.

Spain attempted once or twice, unless I am misinformed, to establish the gold standard in the Philippine Islands, but she proved unable to maintain it there, and all the gold which she introduced into the Philippine Islands went out, leaving the islands as they

Mr. LODGE. It went out, the Senator from Wisconsin says, and stayed out. The last time, I think, was more than twenty years ago, when some Spanish gold was brought in there.

The committee felt that if an attempt was made to impose the gold standard upon those islands at this time it would be necessary for the United States to undertake the maintenance of a gold reserve. They saw no other way to do it. Taking all these conreserve. They saw no other way to do it. Taking all these considerations together, the great responsibility of undertaking to maintain a gold standard in those islands, the change in the existing system, which was involved with all possible perils, the committee felt that the safe and wise thing to do was, for the present at least, to leave the islands on the silver standard, to which they had always been accustomed.

It was represented to the committee that placing it on the gold standard would improve the trade of the islands with the gold-standard countries; but all the world trades with China, with the Straits Settlements, with Singapore and Hongkong, on the silver standard. The Philippine Islands form part of that mone-tary system, and only a small part, and it did not seem to the committee that there would be any very great advantage in making a change as to the Philippine Islands, but that on the contrary the balance of advantage would probably be in leaving the Philippine Islands as a part of the same monetary system to which they had already belonged.

Therefore, to repeat what I said at the beginning, we make no change in the money standard of the islands. We leave it as it was. We simply give them what they greatly need and of which they are now destitute—a good subsidiary coinage, both of copper and silver—and instead of the free coinage of Mexican dollars, now the unit of value, we substitute for it a Filipino-American dollar, well coined, well made, which we believe will not only furnish them with a good dollar which will pass by tael and not by weight, but which will enter into all the commerce of the Orient, especially China, and will perform the same useful office for us that the Bombay dollar has performed in China for the commerce of

England.
Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I understand that this proposition meets with the approval of the people who have been most

experienced in the trade of that section of the world, who gave this their approval. Is that the fact?

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator asked me that question. The subcommittee, of which I was not a member, but which allowed me to be present at the hearings, at some of which the Senator from Colorado was also present, heard the representative of the Hongkong and Shanghai bank; they heard Mr. Forbes, who for more than twenty years was the managing partner of

UNION RAILROAD STATION.

SENATE.

the great American house of Russell & Co., in China—not bankers, but a trading company; and they heard Mr. Macy, a large tea merchant, in regard to the conditions of commerce in the They were all unanimous in the opinion that in the interest of American commerce in China and in the East generally, there was nothing to be gained by making a change in the standard of money in the Philippine Islands. That is wholly apart from the consideration of the dangers involved always in a change of the money standard.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And much would be lost?
Mr. LODGE. And that much would be lost in attempting the change. We also heard from Mr. Conant, who had been sent out by the War Department to investigate this subject. He made a very able and elaborate presentation to the committee of the plan of substituting a modified form of the gold standard for the silver standard now in use in the islands. The subcommittee, however, and I think the full committee, became satisfied, after hearing all this evidence, that the opinion of the men actually engaged in oriental commerce was correct, and that it was better under existing conditions, and with a view especially to the market of China, that we should maintain the existing standard in the Philippine Islands, to give them a dollar which would play the same part that the English-Bombay dollar has played in the Chinese trade.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will pardon me, I ask him if it is not true also that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Aldrich] was present at the hear-

ings, and these gentlemen convinced the committee that it would be difficult, to say the least, if not impossible, for us to maintain

the gold standard there?
Mr. LODGE. As the Senator from Idaho reminds me, Senator Aldrich was present at the hearings also, as well as the Senator from Colorado. I know I went to those hearings with my inclination toward the substitution of the gold standard, and I think we were all convinced-

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It was unanimous.

Mr. LODGE. Including the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Colorado. I think we were all convinced after hearing these things from the merchants of the East that the only thing to do was to adopt the plan which the committee finally agreed upon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Yesterday unanimous consent was had that immediately after the routine business on Thursday morning we should proceed to take a vote upon the bill known as the union railroad station bill. In view of the short time in which we shall have to debate that very important question, I think I am justified in asking the Senator from Massachusetts if he will not consent to have the unfinished business temporarily laid aside that we

may take up the railroad bill.

Mr. LODGE. I, of course, am extremely anxious to get on with this bill. I want to have the debate continued until all Senators have spoken who desire to speak. I do not like to lay aside the

bill if it is possible to continue the debate.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. There does not seem to be anyone dis-

posed to go on.

Mr. LODGE. I gave notice that I would move to-day that the Senate to-morrow and on subsequent days until the bill was disposed of shall meet at 11 o'clock. I am extremely averse to making that motion. I know how much inconvenience it causes to Senators in the committee work. From what has been said to me by Senators in committee and in private conversation, I am in hopes that we may soon reach a conclusion upon this bill.

I do not mean any assurance as to a particular day, but if I could have some general assurance as to the possibility of bringing the bill to a vote I should be very glad to withhold the motion. I do not desire to make it. From what Senators upon the other side have said to me I am led to believe that there was no disposition to have anything but a full and fair debate, and to disposition to have anything but a full and fair debate, and to allow the subject to come to a vote at the earliest reasonable moment compatible with full debate. Of course I should be glad to fix a day, if Senators would be willing to name any day, on which we can have a vote. But in any event, Mr. President, I will not press the motion to-day, because I am in hopes that some arrangement may be come to which will enable us to close the debate within a reasonable time. If there is no one else who desires to go on with the discussion this afternoon, then of course I would be very glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota, as I am anxious that we shall get that bill out of the way. anxious that we shall get that bill out of the way

Then, Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business may be

temporarily laid aside.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask unanimous consent that the rail-

road bill may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, He also asks that the bill known as the union station bill be laid before the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4825) to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia,

and for other purposes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I have never heretofore taken any part in the debate in regard to matters which pertain to the District of Columbia, and I have never had the time nor the district of Columbia. position. I am not sufficiently familiar with the District affairs to discuss many of the measures which come before the Senate in a way that would be intelligent. But upon the statement yesterday evening of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Gallinday evening of the senator from New Hampshite Lift. Gallander of the senator from every point of view, so inexcusable, and such little reason given why the bill should pass, as reported by the committee, that I made certain inquiries of him in regard to the objects and purposes and the consideration that the Government was to receive for the large amount of money proposed to be given to this railroad corporation. It may be that I take an exaggerated view of the matter, but to me it is absolutely not to be explained by anything that I have heard heretofore why this Government should make an absolute donation of \$4,600,000. I think it is admitted and claimed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] to be between six and seven million dellars.

Hansbrough] to be between six and seven million dollars.

As I understand the proposition, the Pennsylvania Railroad, since 1871, perhaps, has occupied certain lands belonging to the Government. I think the road has never paid any rent or anything to the Government for that land. A year and a half ago a bill was passed providing that they should have the use of other land belonging to the Government to extend and build a new depot. That land was estimated, I think, to be worth a million and a half of dollars. Now the Senator from New Hampshire yesterday (and I called his special attention to it when I asked him the question) said the consideration was the removal of the grade crossings. I asked him if another consideration was not that this railroad company was to erect a new depot on this new land that the Government was to give them, or give them the use of. He said no, it was the removal of the grade crossings. have looked at the bill which passed a year and a half ago and I

find in that bill the following provision:

The station buildings to be erected on the Mall shall cost not less than \$1,500,000.

Now, that is the consideration stated in the act, and yet the railroad has expended no money. The conditions are precisely the same. The act of a year and a half ago provides substantially that Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal the law. There has been nothing whatever to prevent the Congress of the United States to-day from repealing that act. There can be no claim of justice or that any other equities have arisen because nothing has been done and no expenses incurred. Yet instead of repealing that act, if it is desired to establish the depot

stead of repealing that act, if it is desired to establish the depot at another point, this bill proposes to give the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad \$3,000,000 and to provide for the expenditure of \$1,600,000 more.

Now, why should we give them \$3,000,000 for this privilege that we granted them a year and a half ago to build this station on that ground? Can any man give a reason why we owe the Pennsylvania road \$1,500,000 in order to get them to relinquish this right when the law itself says that Congress has the right to repeal it? They have expended nothing. It was a grant to them by Congress for the use of this land, and yet in the bill now pending it is proposed that we shall give \$1,500,000 to that railroad, \$1,500,000 to the Baltimore and Ohio, and \$1,600,000 for improvements to be made on the new depot.

s1,500,000 to the Saltimore and Ohio, and \$1,600,000 for improvements to be made on the new depot.

Is that a fair proposition? Why should we do this? Will the Senator from New Hampshire tell us why, instead of repealing this law, as was reserved the right to do, when no expense to the railroad has been incurred on account of it, the Government of the United States should appropriate out of its Treasury \$4,600,000 and give to this immensely weelthy converging to day.

and give to this immensely wealthy corporation to-day—
Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator did not think it perhaps well to allude to me, I would not interrupt him.
Mr. BERRY. I would be glad to be interrupted if the Senator

desires to do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that not only does the railroad company give back the land that was given last year, but likewise removes the depot and all their buildings from the Mall, and that reverts to the Government of the United States. I wish to say, furthermore, to the Senator-the Senator, I have

I wish to say, furthermore, to the Senator—the Senator, I nave no doubt, wants to be fair about this matter—

Mr. BERRY. I do if I know it.

Mr. GALLINGER. This proposition is a simple one. One of three things can be done. We can go into the matter of municipal ownership; we can pass this bill granting these corporations precisely the amount of money that we pledged them in the bills that are now lower or we can propose to do that and they will be the control of the proposed that the control of the proposed them in the bills that are now lower or the senator. that are now laws, or we can refuse to do that, and they will

proceed under existing laws to construct two stations, one of which will be on the Mall.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Not if we repeal the law. Mr. BERRY. Not if the law is repealed. They have incurred no expense under it. It was a grant authorizing them to do it in consideration of their erecting a building there. One of the con-

siderations was \$1,500,000. They have not built it.

Mr. GALLINGER. They have incurred expense. They have their building there now. In 1871 Congress asked the Pennsyl-

vania Railroad to come into the District.

Mr. BERRY. Does the Senator mean to say that they have incurred expense since the passage of the act?

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all.

Mr. BERRY. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. GALLINGER. Simply because the committee has asked

them not to do it pending the consideration of this bill.

Mr. BERRY. That is the truth.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will not put me in a false attitude.

Mr. BERRY. I do not desire to do so.
Mr. GALLINGER. In 1871 Congress asked the Pennsylvania
Railroad to come into the District of Columbia. Congress gave
them a site south of Virginia avenue. Before they had built on that Congress changed its mind and gave them the site where their railroad station now stands. They constructed that station. They put up their train sheds. They have paid taxes on that land for thirty-one or thirty-two years. The Senator says they can be dispossessed. Perhaps they can. Will Congress do it? Does the Senator believe Congress will do it? I do not believe the Senator thinks Congress will do that thing.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator is through, I will tell him what I

think about it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not quite through, Mr. President. Now, the Senator will not put the committee in the attitude of giving away six or seven million dollars. The committee in its wisdom, and Congress in its wisdom, a year and a half ago, for the purpose of eliminating the grade crossings in the District of Columbia, did make a donation of a million and a half in money to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and gave the Pennsylvania Railroad certain lands. Those three millions are to-day appropriated, and this bill appropriates not one single cent additional, except \$1,670,000, which the Government and the District of Columbia are asked to expend to improve the streets and to pay damages around the proposed new railroad station, which it is their very manifest duty to do. That is all there is to it.
Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the Senator says, and only re-

peats what he said yesterday, that the only consideration for the passage of the bill a year and a half ago was to remove the grade reasons. Now, I assert that the bill itself says that in consideration of that the Pennsylvania Railroad undertook to erect a station on the Mall worth \$1,500,000, and it is in the law. That is a part of the consideration, Mr. President, for this grant of \$1,500,000.

Mr. GALLINGER rose.

Mr. BERRY. Let me get through with my statement and then I will hear the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not going to interrupt the Senator.
Mr. BERRY. I repeat, that building has not been erected.
The Senator seeks to go back to the act of 1871 to evade the force of what I said in reference to the last act. I repeat, Mr. President, that under that act it is proposed to give them \$1,500,000 in consideration of the removal of certain grade crossings and the further consideration that they will erect a station worth \$1,500,000. They have incurred no expense whatever up to this time since the passage of that act. The law itself says that Congress may repeal it. Congress may repeal it to-day, and they are not injured. Nor can it be claimed that they have been unfairly

I repeat, that we in the pending bill are giving them \$1,500,000 for the Pennsylvania, \$1,500,000 for the Baltimore and Ohio, and \$1,600,000, that is admitted; and it is claimed by the Senator from North Dakota to amount to more than \$6,000,000 altogether to be

given for the improvements that are to be made.

Now, tell me, Mr. President, why should we do this thing? In every railroad that is built throughout the country where they are compelled to go into cities they have to pay for the right of way. They have to pay for their own depot. They have to keep the grade crossings in such a manner as to not endanger the lives of the people. They do it in every other city.

Ah, but the Senator said yesterday that in some of the Northern cities the towns have contributed something to remove grade crossings. I have no doubt but that is true. Mr. President, cities throughout this country have done a good many things in regard to granting privileges to railroads and corporations and granting franchises that have not been approved by the country or by the

people or the cities in which they were done. I say that that is

no precedent that we should follow here.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will promise not to interrupt him again while he is making his speech, and if what he says needs an answer I will make the answer in my own time.

Mr. BERRY. All right.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator says that this corporation promised to erect a station costing a million and a half dollars, which is true. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad obligated itself to erect a station costing I think, \$750,000, which would be \$2,225,000, for which they get this donation, as the Senator chooses to call it, of \$3,000,000. That donation is continued. The Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio railroads have obligated sylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio railroads have obligated themselves to construct a station worth \$5,000,000. They have obligated themselves to build a tunnel so that the roads from the Senator's country can pass into this magnificent union station that will cost \$1,700,000. So the corporations are going to expend more than twice what they obligated themselves to expend on these two stations, which the Senator says have not been built. That is all I care to say on that point.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire continually

evades the proposition by claiming now that unless we do this

they can go on and erect these buildings.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly, they can.

Mr. BERRY. I answer that by saying that we can repeal the law to-day, and the law expressly provides-

Mr. Gallinger rose.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will excuse me, I will yield a little later. The law provides that it may be repealed, and it is no excuse for Congress to say to-day that we have to do this, otherwise they would do something else in regard to the Mall that Congress does not want done. Why should we give them,

Trepeat, this \$4,600,000?
The roads are running here for their own profit. In every part of the country they are required to pay for the right of way, and they are required to build their own stations. If I am not misinformed about the magnificent union depot at St. Louis, it was paid for by the railroads. It was never claimed that it ought to paid for by the railroads. It was never claimed that it ought to be paid for by the city, and neither the city of St. Louis nor the State of Missouri, I think, ever gave them money to build it. Upon the contrary, they were compelled to pay for the right of way through that city wherever they desired to use the streets or the public property of the city. Yet here to-day we are confronted by a bill which proposes to give this great corporation, for it is all practically one—the Pennsylvania Railroad—\$1,600,000 more, and then it is claimed an additional amount to pay for more, and then it is claimed an additional amount to pay for

Now, why should we give this money to this great corporation, Mr. President? It is their business to build these stations. They are for their profits. They run these railroads in here because it pays them to run them, and why should the Government of the United States give them this money? It will not do to claim it was because Congress made a mistake a year and a half ago and made these promises, because nothing has been done under that contract. It can be repealed, I repeat, to-day, and we owe them nothing. We do not owe them a million and a half dollars because Congress promised to give them land valued at that much

I submit, Mr. President, I should be glad to see a union station built here, if built properly; but I can never consent, nor can I see how Senators on this floor can vote, to take money out of the public Treasury and absolutely make a gift of it to this corpora-tion, which is already immensely wealthy.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BERRY. I will yield the floor to the Senator if he de-

sires it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do not wish to take the floor at this time, but I understand that other Senators desire to speak on this subject. I simply want to call the attention of the Senator and of the Senate to the fact that in the statement which I had inserted in the RECORD yesterday, prepared by the railroad committee of the Board of Trade of this city, composed of eminent business men, this statement is made with respect to the actual amount of money which the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia are to expend or are to donate to this corporation. The statement reads as follows:

It also proposes that the railroads be given \$6.792.521 for making the alterations in their terminals, of which amount the District of Columbia is to pay \$2,804,000, as follows—

Then these gentlemen have gone on here and itemized this statement:

One million six hundred thousand dollars for the plaza in front of the depot.

That is admitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. GALLINGER. Not that the District is to pay it. I do not admit that. I admit the District is to pay half of it and the Government to pay half.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. In this report it is all charged to the District.

Mr. GALLINGER. That shows they do not know what they are talking about.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Possibly not. The report continues:
One hundred and seventy thousand dollars for changes in South Washington, paving, and damage to property, \$750,000 bonus to the Baltimore and Obio Railroad Company, and \$284,000 as its half of the cost of the highway

The statement proceeds further:

The \$1.454.000 given in real estate is largely in streets closed, which belong to the United States, but are a loss to the citizens of the District rather than the United States. The right of way for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad through the Beform-School grounds is a loss to a District institution, unestimated in any of the reports, and the damage to property abutting on streets closed by the bill is entirely unprovided for and must fall on the owners, citizens of the District. citizens of the District.

Here is another statement from this report which, it seems to

me, is worthy of consideration:

The cost of the highway bridge, if properly constructed, is estimated by the War Department to be \$996,000, instead of the \$568,000 already appropriated.

We have appropriated \$568,000 in the act passed in 1901 for the

construction of a highway bridge. The report then continues:
So that the estimated cost to the District is too little in this instance and
may be too small in other particulars. It is probable that the District contribution to the railroad improvements will not be less than \$4,000,000.

That is the District alone.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, not having been present during all this discussion, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota, for my information, whether Congress can compel the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to remove their depots from where they are at present situated without compensating them.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Of course, that is a question that the Senator from Connecticut is much better able to decide than I am able to decide it. It involves a legal question, and we all know

the Senator is a great lawyer, and he ought to know.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not know anything about the facts; I do not know how the railroad companies acquired the right to put their depot buildings and sheds where they are, and I do not know what the terms are.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. My understanding is that in 1871 the Mr. HANSBROUGH. My understanding the city council of the city of Washington was asked by the railroad company for the privilege of entering the city.

rairoad company for the privilege of entering the city. That request was granted by the then existing council, and the railroad came into the District. I believe that is the history of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that the citizens of the District petitioned the railroad company to come into the city and gave them a location just south of Virginia avenue, and afterwards the location where they are now situated.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. That is correct, I think. The city council, which was then in existence, had charge of such matters at the time; but since then the railroad companies have been coming in, and gradually, but steadily, encroaching upon the city of Washington, giving us a fair service, for which the people of Washington have paid—there is no dispute as to that—until now they propose to continue their encroachments and bore a hole through the middle of this Capitol Hill, within 50 feet of the place where the great Library building is located, and to run their trains through that, so that the road completely crosses the city

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If the Senator will permit me, the reason of my inquiry is this: I suppose that everyone will admit the desirability of a union station—

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do, certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. But the question as to which I desire information is whether we can take these railroads by the throat and say, "Remove your depots and build a union station," without paying them any money. Can we do that? That is without paying them any money. Can we do that? That is what I want to get at.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I think the Senator will agree with me that these railroad companies have no grants of these lands; that they are mere tenants at will, and that what we have been giving them has been in the nature of an easement—that is all—because we have always added a section at the conclusion of every one of these railroad acts which has been passed that "Congress hereby reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act. Now, if we had granted to the railroad company anything beyond a mere easement—a mere right to use the land—if we had given them a title to this land, we could not repeal the act. I submit that to the Senator as a lawyer.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North

Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Yes, cir. Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I was going to say to the Senator from North Dakota that it appears to me, while his conten-tion is strictly in accordance with the law, there are certainly equities here. The railroad company has occupied the land, of course as a kind of tenant at will or as a matter of benefit to itself mainly; but it has built a depot there, and while undoubtedly Congress can say, "We have given you a great deal all these years, because we let you have all this land without paying any money for it," still the question of equity would come in as to whether we can say to them, "Now, get out," and they lose their depot building. That is the only point I can see that the Senator from Connecticut could hinge any argument on in behalf of the rail-

road company.
Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will permit me, it is not a proposition that the railroad company shall vacate the property they now occupy; it is not a proposition to compel them to build a union station. They desire, indeed they prefer, and probably, from the necessities of the case, they will in a short time be compelled to have greater depot facilities than they have at present. There is no proposition here upon the part of the Government to force them to vacate the land they have occupied for thirty years without paying rent. That is not the proposition. The proposition is for this Government to build for them a union station, or tion is for this Government to build for them a union station, or to contribute toward that purpose some six or seven million dollars, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Hans-brough]. A part of this is to be paid by the Government, and the greater part, I think, and some of it is to be paid by the District of Columbia.

I contend that it is inexcusable that the railroad company should ask the Government for or that the Government should for one moment think of giving them money to build for them more comfortable quarters and more desirable to them, to build for them a great union station. Why should we give them the money? That is what I want to know. When we ask this question, we are told in reply that we passed a law eighteen months ago, and that if we do not give them this money they will go on under that law and erect a station; but it turns out that under that law they have incurred no expense, and no equities whatever have arisen under that act. It could be repealed to-day without injury to anybody, and yet we are told that because we did make that grant of an easement, or whatever you may call it, we must therefore take some \$4,600,000 and donate it to these two companies.

is the proposition.
Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator misunderstood my position. was answering a question of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] in regard to compelling the railroad companies to leave their present depots. I was not saying anything about the act which was passed here a year or so ago, giving them the right to enlarge their present terminal facilities, to do away with grade enlarge their present terminal facilities, to do away with grade crossings, and leaving the buildings they now occupy, and all that kind of thing, because under that act they have done nothing. Therefore they have no claim to equity on that score at all. The only claim they can put up here would be one for having to give up their present station buildings on Sixth street and to go somewhere else. Then they might say, "We have built this great structure here, costing two or three or four or five hundred thousand dollars"—I do not know how much—"our tracks, etc.; you are depriving us of the structures which you asked us to build, and you certainly ought not to take our property without giving and you certainly ought not to take our property without giving us something for it."
Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not think that this Gov-

ernment, after the expenditure it has made in the construction of the Library and the Capitol here, can afford to allow these two depots to remain where they are. They mar the appearance of the city, and I do not think we can afford to allow them to stay.

The structure that is proposed is a very different character of structure than the railroad companies would build for themselves. They would not erect any such monumental buildings as are proposed. Here, however, the demand was made upon them to make the buildings correspond with the Library, the Capitol, and with the grounds here, and to put it in a place where the whole thing would be in harmony. I think Congress ought to see to it that would be in harmony. I think Congress ought to see to it the surroundings of this Capitol are in harmony with it. depot down here mars the whole appearance of this end of the We can not continue to have it in that way. It has got to be changed.

I think there is a good deal in the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Bacon] that the Government ought to pay a much larger proportion than one-half of the expense involved. I think it is one of the things you should take into account that this city as a city, without having regard for this Capitol, would not think of contributing to build such a structure

as this is to be. We have spent a good deal of money for the beautification of this city. A building for the Library, to contain all the books that are, there could have been constructed just as well as the present structure for less than half the money, probably for one-fourth the money, the present building has cost. But the building is right here adjoining the Capitol, and so it was determined that a building for the Library should be erected which would be the pride of the nation.

I think there is nothing that so mars the whole situation as these depots, the one on the Mall and the one right down here, cutting off access in that direction between the Printing Office and the Capitol. Every person who comes to this city and views its magnificent buildings and grounds is shocked by some of the

surroundings. They ought to be made attractive.

I do not think we ought to allow these improvements to go on as proposed in the bill of last year. It is said that we can now repeal that bill. Certainly we can if we want to do so, and if we do not take some such action as is now proposed we will have a structure there that nobody wants to have. When men of taste examine these structures they say they are eyesores. The Commission which laid out the plans for greater Washington has said that these depots mar the entire situation, and that they should be removed. I have nothing to do with that. I am not on the subcommittee, but the chairman of the committee has been negotiating with the railroad companies for some time to get their consent to this project. So far as they are concerned, it will be cheaper for them to stay where they are and make only such improvements as are necessary than it will be to erect this great structure—a building that is to be longer than the entire Capitol.

Mr. HANNA. May I ask the Senator a question? Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. HANNA. Is it not true that the Committee on the District of Columbia asked the railroad companies to change their plans, and not that the railroad companies came and demanded the change?

Mr. STEWART. The request came from the committee. Mr. HANNA. And is it not true that the railroad companies were perfectly satisfied to go ahead under the law of a year and a half ago?

Mr. GALLINGER. They would rather do so.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly that is true. As the Senator from New Hampshire says, they would rather do so now.

The chairman of the committee talked with me about this matter, and I expressed my opinion to him that we could better afford to make some sacrifice than have all this end of the city and the Capitol marred by the continuance of these structures. All men who have traveled take this view. We are spending money to make this capital city what it ought to be; and these eyesores ought to be done away with. The railroad companies do not ask for this. They can get along very well with cheaper structures than those which are now proposed.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me a moment? Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Stewart] says that the railroad companies do not desire this privilege. That to me is a remarkable statement, when this is a direct proposition to give them some \$6,000,000 to build a depot, not as we built the Library, for the benefit of the people of the United States, but to build a depot for this railroad company to be their property; and yet the Senator seeks to make that appear the same as building the Library, which, as I have said, was for the benefit of the people of the United States, and is the property of the United States, and yet he tells us that this railroad company does not desire it.

The Senator says that the law can be repealed by which we promised to give the railroad company \$3,000,000 two years ago. That law ought never to have been passed. The Senator admits that that law can be repealed, but he says it will not be repealed. Why will it not be repealed? It will not be repealed because the the majority of this Senate and of the other House will not vote for its repeal when they know it ought to be repealed before any

injury shall come.

You say the passage of that act was a great mistake. Then, if so, why should we not repeal it? You do not pretend that there is any injury to come to anybody by its repeal—that we should be in the same position we were before the act was passed? We have a right to repeal it. You admit it was a bad law, and yet you stand here upon the floor of the Senate and say that Congress will not repeal it. Then let Senators tell the country why Congress will not do it.

Mr. STEWART. All right. Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. STEWART. I want to reply to the Senator from Arkansas

[Mr. Berry]

The repeal of that act would not put us in any better position than we now are. It would not remove the nuisance. We tried

at the last session to get the Baltimore and Ohio depot put back a little farther and to arrange things in such a way that it would not be so uncomely. We made a mistake in doing that, and I do not think we accomplished what we desired. The Baltimore and Ohio depot here is a disgrace to the city, and if the other depot is to remain where it is, we would be without any suitable arrangements for depots in this city.

We want depot buildings of a better character. The plan now is that the railroad companies shall erect a building longer than this Capitol. We required them to put in the description of the buildings they would erect to correspond in an architectural point of view with the public buildings at the capital. All this has been done; and the repeal of that act would leave us in a worse condition than we were before we passed the other act. Do we want these depots always to remain where they are?

I know that all these acts contain a provision reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal; but no court would allow that to be done without our making compensation. If you require a railroad company to put up a depot building and provide that they must make a certain expenditure in doing so, and they have done that, are transacting their business there, no court would say that Congress could repeal such an act without making compensation to the company for the damage done them. Of course the power to alter, amend, or repeal is retained, but the railroad companies have acted upon the provisions of the bill, and they

Mr. STEWART. They have acted on the former law.

Mr. STEWART. They have acted on the former one. If we want to have suitable terminal facilities in this city and to have railroad stations that will be an ornament to the capital city and in harmony with the great Government structures here, we should

promptly pass this bill. Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if he does not think that instead of donating and giving this subsidy—for it may be called a subsidy, I think, or whatever it is—to a railroad company of six or seven million dollars, or any other sum, it would be far better for Congress to authorize the District of Columbia to itself build this monumental station. We all want a monumental station. Now, would it not be a far better business project for the District of Columbia to do this and charge the railroad companies for the accommodation that they would be obliged to have here, and thus repay the debt within thirty or forty years?

Why is not that a better business proposition than to make a free gift of this six or seven million dollars to the railroad companies? Mr. STEWART. If you built that union station you could not remove their present depots from where they are without you let them come in free. So you would not get very much out of it. Perhaps the court would say if you provided another place for them with better accommodations, that might be equitable, but you would have to allow them to come in practically for nothing.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will ask the Senator why it is that in

the city of Boston, which built a subway, through which the electric roads run, which cost the city \$5,000,000, and they are receiving a return of about 5 per cent on that investment, which pays interest on the bonds and provides a suitable sinking fund to discharge

ne debt. Is not that a good business proposition?

Mr. STEWART. I do not know what is the situation or what the debt.

are the facts there, but I do know that the railroads could not get into those streets, and so it became necessary for the railroads to have a subway, and they readily consented to it. I have not been in Boston for several years, but I know the conditions that formerly prevailed there.

Mr. GALLINGER. And they have some pretty heavy damage suits on hand that will take off their dividends.

Mr. STEWART. They can not go through the streets, and of

course they consented to use the subway.

But you can not make the exchange which is talked of here without the consent of the railroad companies, and I think that would be a harder bargain and cost the District much more money than the arrangement made through the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. McMillan], who is a

very good business man and a good railroad man.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Senator would rather give the money outright and let the railroad company take charge of the

railroad facilities of the District for all time?

Mr. STEWART. It is not giving it outright. The situation, I think, is very much exaggerated. I do not know as to the figures, but the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Gallinger], I suppose, has got the figures. The railroad companies are putting out a great deal more money than they would do if they were building a depot in an ordinary town, where it was not necessary to erect monumental buildings, but they have some patriotic motive in this thing. They do not for their purposes have to erect such buildings as those now proposed. If the Government and the city will do their portion, the railroad companies have

consented to carry out a plan which will correspond to the buildings here, and I think that is a fair proposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not occupy many minutes in the further discussion of this bill. I believe it was Mark Twain who said "It is better not to know so much than it is to know so much that is not so," and as I have listened to the discussion of the bill I have come to the conclusion that our witty friend was right in that observation.

It seems to me that the propositions included in this measure are very simple and easy of comprehension. I will endeavor to restate two or three of them, and then will allow the opponents of the bill to occupy the time for the remainder of the day

In 1871, or thereabouts, the people of the District of Columbia, thinking they were oppressed by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, petitioned the Pennsylvania Railroad Company to come into the District of Columbia. As an inducement for them to come here, they granted them the privilege of building a station, sheds, etc., south of Virginia avenue. Previous to that time the municipal government of the District had taken action, I think, or certainly they did so a short time afterwards. It was then thought desirable that the railroad station should be built not south of Virginia avenue, but on the site that is occupied at the present time by the Baltimore and Potomac road. That was thirtyone years ago. That railroad came here by invitation and, accepting the grant of land, constructed their station. I do not argue that it was an absolute grant of land so far as deeding it away to the road was concerned, but, accepting that grant of land, they constructed their station. They have occupied it uninterruptedly for thirty-one years, paying taxes on it. That is the situation, or was the situation, a year and a half ago.
Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me a

question there?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator says they have paid taxes on it. Does he intend to say that they have paid taxes on the land or on

Mr. GALLINGER. On the building, of course.

Nothing on the land? Mr. BERRY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume not. The Government does not bay taxes on its own land, and the Government owns half of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator will permit me one moment. That is certainly true, but I thought from the Senator's argument he was insisting that the railroad company had title to the land.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have never said so in my life. Mr. BERRY. It was simply a right to build there and nothing

Mr. GALLINGER. I did say in debate formerly that I had an impression they had that right, but I afterwards said, upon examination, that I changed my mind on that point. I have been absolutely frank about this matter. They have occupied that place for thirty-one years uninterruptedly. The matter has been absolutely are also been also also been a ter has been discussed over and over again in Congress, and it has always been asserted they were there by sufferance, but no

serious effort has ever been made to dispossess them.

A year and a half ago, Mr. President, we not only conceded their right to remain there, but we granted them further favors by giving them additional land for the purpose of enlarging their plant, if you choose to call it so, and they to-day have the benefit of that legislation of a year and a half ago and can proceed to occupy still more of the Mall if they wish to do so. But the Committee on the District of Columbia, desiring to have a union station, requested the railroad corporations not to proceed under the statutes of a year and a half ago. Various conferences were held with railroad officials. They protested that they preferred the legislation as it exists to-day to the proposed legislation, but ultimately consented not to proceed under those statutes and to seriously consider the matter of a union station.

Mr. President, it is persistently stated here that we are making a contribution to build a railroad station for a railroad corporation. I say we are doing nothing of the kind. When this matter was up some two years ago the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia entered into an investigation as to what other cities were doing in the matter of the elimination of grade There was a demand in this District by the press and crossings. the people that these deadly grade crossings should be gotten rid of, and nobody suggested that the railroad corporations could be compelled at their own expense to get rid of the crossings. Communication was entered into with the officials of the various cities

of the country, and the committee ascertained these facts— Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me one moment right

there?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator asserted that no one contended that the railroad companies should be compelled at their own expense to get rid of these crossings.

Mr. GALLINGER. No one has undertaken to do it.

Mr. BERRY. Does the Senator say the Government can not compel them to do so?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have very serious doubts on that point. Mr. BERRY. As to whether the Government can compel them to do it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have.

Mr. BERRY. I am astonished to hear him say so. Mr. GALLINGER. Of course the Senator insists the Government can do everything. The Senator insists that we can wipe out every right and every investment that these corporations have in the District of Columbia, and while I am forced to admit that the Government has that brute right the Government is not going That is all there is to it.

Mr. President, what did we ascertain? We ascertained that the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of eliminating grade crossings on the Philadelphia and Trenton Railroad, a small corporation, paid \$1,000,020, and the railroad company paid the balance. We found that in the city of New Haven one-half of the cost was paid. We found that by special act of the legislature of Massachusetts, providing for a change of grades, etc., on the Providence division of the Pennsylvania Railroad in the city of Boston, 55 per cent was paid by the railroad company and 45 per cent by the Commonwealth, the city of Boston being required to refund the State 30 per cent of the whole cost.

For similar changes in Brockton, Mass., including new stations, yards, tracks, etc., the railroad company paid 65 per cent, the

State 25 per cent, and Brockton 10 per cent

The law of the State of Massachusetts now provides that no matter from which side an application is made to abolish grade crossings, 65 per cent shall be paid by the railroad company, 25 per cent by the State, and 10 per cent by the municipality.

A recent law of the State of New York divides the cost of abolishing grade crossings as follows: 50 per cent by the railroad company, 25 per cent by the State, and 25 per cent by the municipality.

In a letter dated October 16, 1899, Mr. William Jackson, city engineer of Boston, states that in a special case involving an expenditure of \$4,000,000 the State and the city of Boston paid 45 per cent (of which the city assumed 13.5) and the railroad company paid 55 per cent.

In a letter dated October 17, 1899, Mr. G. S. Webster, chief engineer of Philadelphia, states that in the construction of the Pennsylvania avenue subway whereby 16 grade crossings were abolished, involving an expenditure of \$3,000,000, the city paid one-half and the Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company

paid the other one-half.

Mr. President, the committee ascertained that in Rochester, in Pittsburg, and in other cities in the country substantially the same relative amounts were paid by the corporations and by the municipality, and it was upon that finding and upon that state of facts that the committee acted when they proposed that the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia should make a contribution toward the elimination of grade crossings in the District of Columbia. It was not for the purpose of building railroad stations, and no special pleading will contort the action of the committee into having recommended a proposition of that kind.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Senator insists on saying that the three millions of cash which we have appropriated is for the purpose of eliminating grade crossings. Now, I want to ask the pose of eliminating grade crossings. Now, I want to ask the Senator whether he believes that the elimination of grade crossings within the District of Columbia will cost the sum of \$3,000,000?

Mr. GALLINGER. The committee thought so, and the District Commissioners think so, and if the Senator from North Da-

kota thinks otherwise it is a mere matter of opinion.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, right on that point, I think there are not more than 10 or 15 miles of road in the entire District. I refer to main lines, of course. If there is to be spent \$3,000,000, it is an easy matter to estimate how much per mile it would cost. Does the Senator think it would cost \$100,000 per mile or \$150,000 per mile to eliminate the grade crossings? Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think it would, and even

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do not.
Mr. GALLINGER. When we propose to construct viaducts to bring these roads in far above the grade in many instances, the Senator must give his figures before he can disprove any observations I make on that point.
Mr. HANSBROUGH. The trouble with the Senator is that he

has no figures except what have been supplied by the railroad

company.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is one of these courteous things we meet with in the Senate Chamber sometimes, and I pass it by for what it is worth. The Senator has been exploiting a new theory here. We had the same thing exploited by the late Senator from South Dakota last year on these bills.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Then it is not new.

Mr. GALLINGER. And now we have the same thing exploited by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, that is wholly gratui-

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a fact. The Senator a year and a half ago acted with the committee on the two bills that are on the statute book, and did not raise his voice in opposition to them. The present bill is precisely along the same line as those statutes. Now the Senator appears as a special champion of municipal

Now the Senator appears as a special champion of municipal ownership of a great union station in the city of Washington.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, the Senator knows full well how bills are handled in the Committee on the District of Columbia. As I stated yesterday, the chairman of that committee, the Senator from New Hampshire, and one other Senator composed the railroad subcommittee of that committee. Now, we have uniformly left these questions to that subcommittee. I want to say, Mr. President, the Senator having, perhaps unintentionally, reflected upon me in this matter, that with the immense duties that are on my hands in my own committee I can not duties that are on my hands in my own committee I can not watch everything in the Committee on the District of Columbia any more than the Senator from New Hampshire can watch them, because he has a great committee to attend to also, although I concede that he gives closer attention to District affairs than I have been able to give.

But, Mr. President, I want to say that I believe this bill, brought in here by the Committee on the District of Columbia, was not thoroughly understood by more than six Senators in this body, including the members of the committee, until we commenced to debate it yesterday. To-day one of the members of the committee came to me and said: "I am surprised; I had no idea this bill contained the provisions which it contains, and I propose that it shall go back to the committee so that we may perfect it."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not wonder he was sur-

prised if he took the statement the Senator from North Dakota has made about it. I should think it would surprise anybody on earth.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. No; he had been listening to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from New Hampshire has

not been occupying the floor to-day until now. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from North Dakota has become so watchful, at this late hour, in reference to matters before the Committee on the District of Columbia. When the Sen-

ator says that bills are not properly considered in that committee he does a great injustice to the committee.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I did not say that.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, what did the Senator say? I pause

for a reply.

Mr. President, the Senator has produced a paper here that seems to be the statement of the action of a committee of the Board of Trade called the railroad committee. Those gentlemen did not appear before the committee. This bill has been there for two months. They did not raise a voice against it. If I mistake not, the Board of Trade, at a meeting of that organization, indorsed this bill. I may be wrong, but I think I am right. But a few days ago a committee (I see it is signed by two men, one of whom lives in Virginia and another somewhere else) found out that this is a bad bill, and they have taken their pencils and have gone to work and figured out that under this bill the District of Columbia is to pay \$2,804,000.

Mr. President, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have examined this bill very carefully. They are very competent men. They have the interests of this District very closely at heart, and I have never known anything that was hostile to the interests of the District of Columbia to escape the careful scrutiny of this Commission, composed of very able and learned men. They have made a calculation and they say it will cost the District \$1,635,000. I submit that the District Commissioners are better able to determine what the provisions of this kill are when better able to determine what the provisions of this bill are, when they have had it under consideration days and weeks, than a committee of a business organization which very likely gave it con-

sideration for a few hours.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has presented a substitute for this bill. It proposes municipal ownership of a union railroad station in the city of Washington, and it proposes, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Platt] says, a monumental union railroad station. I wish the Senator, if he had for any reason deemed it wise or expedient to exploit the matter of municipal ownership, had reserved his efforts for some bill that was really a municipal bill, some measure that dealt with municipal matters wholly, rather than for a measure of this kind,

which is so important not only to the interests of the District, but

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator allow me just a word?
Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator allow me just a word?
Mr. HANSBROUGH. My bill does not provide for municipal ownership. It provides for a commission, consisting of the Chief ownership. It provides for a commission, consisting of the Chief Engineer of the Army, the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and the United States Railroad Commissioner, and two citizens to be appointed by the President. That would be more likely to be a United States commission. So we would have the cooperation of the War Department to construct a union sta-tion at the capital of the United States.

I referred to the municipal ownership of the subway in Boston simply by way of illustration to show that it had been a paying affair in the city of Boston, and that there was no reason why it should not be a paying affair in the District of Columbia, and that I preferred that system rather than make a donation, to give

a bonus or subsidy of six or seven millions to this corporation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the city of Boston is making an experiment with a little subway through which a line of electric cars is run. It may be a good investment. Shortly after that subway was built there was a terrible explosion in it, and there are to-day damage cases, aggregating millions of dollars, that are yet to be settled. I do not know whether they will be able to pay dividends on the cost of that subway or not, but at best it is a tunnel through a small portion of the city of Boston.

As I suggested the other day, the great State of Massachusetts bored a tunnel through Hoosac Mountain, and the State of Massachusetts undertook to operate it, and utterly failed to operate it to the interests of the people of Massachusetts. They hastened to lease it to a private corporation, and afterwards sold it. That was a little experiment in the progressive and rich State of Massachusetts of municipal ownership that did not pan out very well, as we Yankees sometimes sav.

as we Yankees sometimes say.

It may be that this little subway in Boston will be a profitable enterprise. It has not been there long enough for us to know whether it will be profitable or not; but whether it is or not, it is a very different proposition from the proposition that is involved in building a union railroad station for the city of Washington and for the six or seven railroad corporations that center at the

capital of the nation.

Mr. President, the Senator has presented his substitute. It is a very crudely drawn measure. He is going to have a station, but he does not say where he is going to have it. I do not know but that he is going to have it attached to one of Santos-Dumont's dirigible baloons up in the air over the city of Washington, to be reached by some method or other. It may be that the Senator is reached by some method or other. It may be that the Senator is going to have it in Eckington, or in Washington, or on the classic shores of the Eastern Branch. He has not provided any place for it, but he is going to have a great union station, built by the District of Columbia, and I suppose they can build precisely where they please.

The Senator proposes that the District shall invest \$10,000,000 in that station, and yet the District Commissioners say it is going to cost \$14,814,103 to build the station as it is contemplated. I do not know whether this is to be as great a station as that or not, but it is very evident, Mr. President, that the Senator has not provided a suitable location for his station, and he has not made a sufficient appropriation to construct it along the lines that the District Committee and the District Commissioners have thought

were desirable for the city of Washington.

The existing railroad companies, according to the Senator's bill, are to remove their buildings and tracks, but no provision is made to compensate them. I suppose he is going to proceed upon the assumption that some men have defended in this country that we can confiscate private property if we choose to do it. I think if the Senator's scheme should go through here he or somebody would have some litigation in the District of Columbia that might be very expensive.

Now, Mr. President, I do not believe we are going into municipal ownership in the District of Columbia of a railroad station. I think I understand the Senator's purpose, and I do not believe the Senator himself expects we will ever do it. I believe fur-thermore, Mr. President, that we are not going to dispossess the railroad companies of this District of the privileges that were granted to them more than a quarter of a century ago. I do not believe we are going to repeal the laws that were passed a year and a half ago, unless we provide, as we do in this bill, for something better for the District of Columbia.

If this bill fails, then the two railroad corporations will proceed to build under the laws that were passed in the Fifty-sixth Congress, and we will have a station near the site of the Baltimore and Ohio and we will have a station hear the site of the Baltimore and Ohio and we will have a station substantially on the site now occupied by the Baltimore and Potomac road. That is what is coming, and it is a mere question whether or not we want that condition of things in the city of Washington or whether we want, as is contemplated by this bill, one magnificent union station that will be a monument and a pride to every citizen of this

great Republic.

Mr. President, Senators of course have a right to take issue with the conclusion reached by the Committee on the District of Columbia. I have not given very much time to the consideration of this matter. I have cooperated with the distinguished chairman of the committee as best I could, and I want to say that in all the history of legislation no Senator has ever given more careful study, more patient consideration, more enlightened judgment to a public measure than has the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMillan] to the bill that is now before the Senate of the United States. He is a thorough business man. He is a man whose integrity has never been questioned. He is a man who, for his life, would not recommend anything that would not in his judgment be calculated to best subserve the interests. not in his judgment be calculated to best subserve the interests of the people of Washington and the people of the whole country. He believes in this bill as I believe in it, and it rests now with the Senate in its wisdom to say whether or not, as the Senator from North Dakota suggests it may, but which I know it will not do, send it back to the committee for further consideration, or whether or not it shall be enacted into law or defeated by a vote of the Senate, and these two railroad corporations be permitted to construct new stations under the acts of Congress that were adopted during the session of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Now, Mr. President, consider for just one moment the question Now, Mr. President, consider for just one moment the question of an ornamental railroad station in the city of Washington. The railroad companies do not want it. Why should they want it? Mr. Loree, president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, a man of wonderful ability and of great railroad experience, said to our committee: "We do not want any such railroad structure as that. We want a railroad building like the station in the off London placered from ton to bettom with handbills. We of London, placarded from top to bottom with handbills. We want a business station. That is what we want, and if I had my way," he said, "that is the kind of a station I would build, because it is a question of business with us and not a question of ornamentation. But if the Congress of the United States requires us to build a railroad station of this kind, we will put our hands in our pockets and expend millions of dollars for the simple purpose of ornamentation and for nothing else." My good, dear, lovable friend from Arkansas smiles at this observation, and yet the Senator must know that there are millions of dollars to go into this proposed structure that will not benefit the railroad cor-

poration one single dollar.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me one moment?

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me one moment?
Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.
Mr. BERRY. I smile because the Senator, in referring to the president of the Baltimore and Ohio road, said it was purely a matter of business with him; that he wanted a station that could be placarded all over, and this was what he desired, and in the next breath said that that railroad president would put his hand in his pocket and spend millions of dollars in order to ornament the city.

the city.

Mr. GALLINGER. If Congress demanded it.

Mr. BERRY. I was smiling at the inconsistent statement the Senator made in the same breath. Mr. President, I think that the first statement of the president of the railroad was the correct statement; that it was purely a matter of business with him; and when the Senator tells me that the presidents of these two railroads through patriotism are going to build a station that will ornament this city I tell him that I think he is mistaken.

Mr. GALLINGER. So far—

Mr. BERRY. They are going to build it and have it because Congress is going to furnish a large part of the money to help them build it, if this bill becomes a law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Congress is not going to get a profit on a piece of iron or a piece of granite in that station.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I wish to make an observation before I yield. The Senator from Arkansas thought that I was inconsistent, but the gray matter of the Senator, which usually runs in level director becomes a little bit involved into the contraction. a level direction, became a little bit involved just at that point; that was all.

I say, Mr. President, Congress demands that this kind of a structure shall be built. Congress has made an appropriation for the purpose of helping eliminate the grade crossings in the Dis-trict of Columbia, and these corporations—not this corporation, the two corporations—propose to expend \$13,073,103, according to the figures furnished by the District Commissioners, and yet the Senator says that they of their own free will and because it is a good business proposition are willing to expend \$13,000,000 in the District of Columbia to construct a railroad station.

I say to you, Mr. President, that they would not do anything of the kind if they were left to themselves. They would not construct any such railroad station. They would not spend any such

amount of money, but it is demanded of them by Congress. It is demanded of them by the gentlemen who have this great park system in their keeping and who are hoping to see the city of Washington, as I hope to live and see it, infinitely more beautiful than it is to-day. These gentlemen have some patriotism as well as the rest of us, and they are willing to pay something to help along this great scheme of beautification of this city, and they deserve, Mr. President, unstinted praise from the Senate of the United States instead of the denunciation that has been heaped upon them in this debate.

Now, Mr. President, I think I have said all I will say on this

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt

him?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is in the hands of the Senate, and the Senate can either follow the lead of my distinguished and delightful friend from North Dakota into the misty realms of municipal ownership, the Senate can reject this bill and relegate these railroad companies to the statute that they have now, under which they can build two railroad stations unless Congress repeals those acts (and Congress will not repeal those acts if this proposed law fails), or Congress can in its wisdom pass this bill and start this grand scheme of beautifying the city of Washington, and do something that future generations will applaud us for instead of condemning us. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his kindness. I simply want to ask the Senator how it

is these railroad companies—he speaks of them in the plural—propose to spend \$13,000,000 in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER. They have furnished their figures to the District Commissioners and the District Commissioners have tabulated them and say they are going to spend it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The District Commissioners have ac-

cepted their figures, and we have got to accept the figures of the District Commissioners.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well.
Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will ask the Senator another queson? How much will this monumental station cost?

Mr. GALLINGER. About \$5,000,000.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The report of the Commissioners says, think the Senator will find, \$4,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I think it says probably \$5,000,000, Mr. HANSBROUGH. I may have misread it, but I think the Senator will find it \$4,000,000; that they said it will cost \$4,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.
Mr. HANSBROUGH. Now, we are giving, according to the
Senator's own admission, over \$4,000,000 in money and property.
Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think we are giving any such amount.

amount.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. In property and money.

Mr. GALLINGER. In building a station?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Yes. In addition to that the railroads, according to their figures, are going to spend \$13,000,000. I ask the Senator as a railroad expert to explain how they are going to spend \$13,000,000 outside of the monumental station itself?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I think I made a misstatement. I got the wrong figures. The District Commissioners say that the railroad companies will expend \$10,073,103, not \$13,000,000, and that the United States and the District of Columbia will spend \$4,770,000.

Now, Mr. President, I have stated this question as accurately and as consistently as I possibly could. I do not think the multiplication of words would add to its elucidation. Some Senators say I have not elucidated it at all. If I have failed to do so, of

course it would be idle for me to continue the discussion.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire has asserted again and again that this railroad company acquired rights in 1871 with which Congress will not interfere. I want to read from a part of an article printed in the Star, of this city, in which it is stated-

The original grant of the right to occupy the Mall for railroad purposes was distinctly temporary. The right to repeal was reserved to the United States avowedly to permit the nation to reclaim it when needed for park purposes. The House refused to value the land and to exact the amount from the railroad lest the national power to reclaim should be destroyed.

Mr. Cameron, a conspicuous champion of the measure, said in the Senate: "I desire to say also that the bill contains a provise allowing Congress to remove the depot at any future time when they desire the ground for a park or for any other purpose. The bill gives Congress the power to do it, and leaves it entirely in the control of Congress."

Then I reveat. Mr. President, that that was the understanding

Then I repeat, Mr. President, that that was the understanding when they moved there. They have occupied it for thirty-one years without paying any rent whatever to the Government of the United States, used that land for that length of time, and yet the Senator from New Hampshire says that Congress is under obligation to pay the Pennsylvania Railroad \$1,500,000 before they can be required to remove from there.

I repeat that when the law was passed it was asserted by Mr. Cameron that the Government would have the right to remove They went in with that understanding and or thirty-one years without paying rent. The them at any time. they have used it for thirty-one years without paying rent. The Government does not owe them one dollar. The Government is under no obligation to pay them any sum of money whatever, and yet the Senator says that we ought to appropriate, I believe he admits, \$4,600,000 for the District and the Government to-gether, and it is claimed that it will be six or seven million

Now, the Senator made another assertion about the abuses that have been heaped upon these railroad presidents. I am sure that he did not intend to apply that to me.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all.

Mr. BERRY. I have not abused them. The Senator himself said that the president of one of these roads said it was purely a matter of business with him, that he wanted such a depot out of which he could make the most money; but immediately asserted thereafter that he was willing to expend a million of dollars of his own money. Yet because I thought there was an inconsistency in that statement the Senator seems to think that my brain was not altogether as clear as it might be.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will accept my correction

of his statement I have no objection, but—

Mr. BERRY. I will accept it.

Mr. GALLINGER. He does not state it as I said it.

Mr. BERRY. I certainly understood the Senator to say that the president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad said they did not want any ornamental depot; that they wanted such a one as they have in London, placarded all over with advertisements; that it was with him a matter of business. If he did not say that I certainly misunderstood him, and I think every other Senator here understood him to say that.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is practically correct that far.

Mr. BERRY. Then he stated afterwards that these gentlemen, if required by Congress, were willing to pay a great deal of money out of their own pockets. Now, Congress has made no such requirement of them. The Senator has argued here all day that they can make no such requirement of them, and yet he says if required by Congress.

Mr. President, you can argue this from now until Thursday morning, it comes back to the same proposition after all, that these railroad companies are compelled to have, in order to properly do their business, additional facilities for depot purposes, and instead of taking the money out of their own pockets (and I am not abusing them about it; I have made no abuse of them about it) they are willing that Congress shall step in and take the money out of the Treasury and build this fine depot for them, and if it will do that they will take it. That is the situation.

The Senator says these grade crossings have been paid for by other cities. Well, Mr. President, as I said a while ago, municipal strategies.

pal corporations have done a good many things that I would hate

for Congress to follow.

He spoke of Philadelphia. It was asserted a year or so ago in the newspapers, and, I think, never denied there, that individuals offered \$5,000,000 in money for a certain franchise in the city of Philadelphia, and yet the municipal corporations granted it to other parties for nothing. I say that is a kind of precedent that I do not think the Senate ought to follow.

I conclude this matter, and all I expect to say about it, as I began. I had no thought of getting into this discussion until on yesterday evening. When I heard the Senator from New Hampshire state what was proposed to be done by this bill, it struck me that it was a gross injustice, that it was an act that could me that it was a gross injustice, that it was an act that could never be defended when the people's representatives took this amount of money—admitted by him to be \$4,600,000—from the Government and from the District and paid it over to a corporation already immensely wealthy. It is unfair. It is useless to talk about the Library, which is a Government building, owned by the whole people of the United States, which was built to beautify and component the city and then turn and say because beautify and ornament the city, and then turn and say because that has been done that we shall give individuals money in order to get them to build structures which will beautify and ornament the city. I say it is not justified.

While I do not agree with the Senator from North Dakota in regard to his proposed remedy, and I do expect to vote for it, at the same time I will not vote for this bill, but I should be glad to vote to repeal the act of a year and a half ago, which all say should never have been passed, which can be repealed to-day under an express provision. There is no excuse for not doing it if it is a bad law and ought to be repealed. I will vote to repeal that, and then we will see as to where and how it will best suit the Government of the United States and the people in this

District to have these depots located.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in reply to the observation the Senator has made two or three times that we all admit the

legislation of the Fifty-sixth Congress was bad legislation, I simply wish to say that I do not admit anything of the kind. We deemed it wise then, and if this bill fails I think it will be determined that that was wise legislation.

DISAPPEARING GUN CARRIAGES.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask that a synopsis of the reports of artil-Mr. PROCTOR. I ask that a synopsis of the reports of artillery officers on the subject of disappearing gun carriages, printed in Senate Document No. 336, may be printed as a document. The letters themselves are very long, but this is a synopsis of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none.

The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Section of the Section of the Senator from the Senator from the Section of the Senator from th

retary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, certain information from the Chief of Ordnance relative to the number of disappearing gun carriages constructed and under contract or construction or authorized, and for what caliber of guns, by whom constructed, etc.

The Chair understands that this communication is in response to a resolution offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Proctor]. Mr. HARRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont by

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont by whom this synopsis has been prepared?

Mr. PROCTOR. It was made in the Board of Ordnance and Fortification. It was prepared by some one of that board or some of the officials for the Secretary of War?

Mr. HARRIS. It came through the Secretary of War.

Mr. PROCTOR. The synopsis does not come through the Secretary of War, as I understand, but it was made to him, and he

Mr. HARRIS. Has he had the synopsis prepared?

Mr. PROCTOR. He had the synopsis prepared and has it in his office. I have not called upon him for that synopsis or the original documents in his possession.

Mr. HARRIS. It is an official document, then, from the Sec-

retary of War?

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes; certainly. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to have it printed?
Mr. PROCTOR.

I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The document will be ordered to be printed, and it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, if there be no objection.

Mr. WARREN. I want to ask if an order has been made for

the printing of that document?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order has been made, but it can be easily reconsidered. The Chair will regard it as an open question. The Chair inquired of the Senator from Vermont, as it is in response to a resolution offered by him, whether or not he desired to have the communication printed.

Mr. WARREN. I understand the document the Senator wishes printed is another document, and is not in response to

his resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the other document has nothing to do with the resolution of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WARREN. The papers in the hands of the Senator from Vermont are the papers furnished by the War Department in response to his resolution, as I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They are.

Mr. WARREN. Have those papers been ordered to be printed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was just asking the Senator from Vermont whether he desired to have them

Mr. PROCTOR. I say of course they should be printed.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will be referred to the
Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed, in the absence of objection.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

In the House of Representatives, May 13, 1902.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 13, 1902.

Resolved, That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1885, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. MAHON, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SIMS be the managers of the conference on the part of the House with the following instructions:
That the conferees be instructed not to agree to what is known as the Selfridge board findings in the Senate amendments.

Mr. SPOONER.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not care anything about the instructions,

Mr. SPOONER. I do not care anything about the instructions, but does that leave this a free conference?

Mr. CULLOM. Not very free, I should think.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was going to ask as a parliamentary inquiry whether if I moved that the request for a conference be granted and conferees appointed we are in any way

bound by the action of the House? As I understand it, the blanks on which we make our returns and the language usually employed in making a conference report sets forth that we have had a free and full conference, etc. If the request of the House is for a full and free conference on the entire bill or the amendments at issue, then I wish to have the request of the House granted.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator must be able to say that the re-

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator must be able to say that the request of the House is for a full and free conference except as to one item, whatever it may be, and as to that there is to be no con-

ference at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Of course the Senate is not bound at all by the instructions given by the House of Represent-atives to its conferees. It may, to a certain extent, deprive it of its character of a full and free conference, but the Senate can insist upon its amendments and go into conference again if it desires to do so. If it does not go into conference, of course the bill is ended.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to make an inquiry as a matter of parliamentary procedure. The House in refusing to agree to a conference report has instructed its conferees. Has it been the practice to send those instructions with its message to the Senate? I do not think I have ever known of it before.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair never has seen anything of that kind done before.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That has been my impression,

and this is entirely new in parliamentary procedure.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Wyoming explain to

the Senate what are the items in controversy, and why there was no agreement reached?

Mr. WARREN. I have no information further than what comes from the reading of the report at the desk. The Senator might ask to have it read again.

Mr. TELLER. Let it be read again.
Mr. WARREN. I ask that it be read again.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will probably be sufficient to report the action of the House as to instructions.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I recollect once we had a dispute on a naval appropriation bill and the House conferees refused absolutely to even report a disagreement. Then the matter was voted on in the Senate as to the items in disagreement, and was voted on in the Senate as to the items in disagreement, and the Senate receded and that ended the trouble. There is an item in this bill in which I am very much interested. It is the claim in regard to the war of 1812, which I have been trying to get set-tled here for three or four years, and there are several other State claims that are very important matters to some of us; but it seems that the trouble is about the claims which were reported by the Selfridge board. I was going to ask whether it would be in order, after the conference report is read, to move that the Senate recede from its amendments to which the House seems so much opposed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to make a motion.

move that the Senate still further insist upon its amendments,

and grant the request of the House for a conference.

Mr. TELLER. Let us have it read, Mr. President, so that we may know what the House has sent us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.
The Secretary read as follows:

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered. That Mr. MAHON, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SIMS be the managers of the conference on the part of the House with the following instructions: That the conferees be instructed not to agree to what is known as the Self-ridge board findings in the Senate amendments.

Mr. President as their practically forecloses one

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, as that practically forecloses one subject which should be given a free conference, I ask that the

report may go over for a day in order that it may be examined.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it will go over for a day.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE IN CUBA.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following report:

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1898) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service in the Republic of Cuba, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

S. M. CULLOM.

S. M. CULLOM, JOHN T. MORGAN, H. C. LODGE, Managers on the part of the Senate. ROBERT R. HITT, HUGH A. DINSMORE, ROBERT ADAMS, JR., Managers on the part of the House. Mr. SPOONER. I should like to have the Senator explain what

the amendments are.

Mr. CULLOM. I am going to do that. The Senate amended the House bill by increasing the salary of the minister proposed to be sent to Cuba from \$10,000 to \$12,000. It also amended the bill by making an appropriation of \$2,000 for rent of a building for the legation, and also provided for an additional consul. conferees of the two Houses met and agreed upon the first amendment, namely, that increasing the salary of the minister, but the Senate conferees were compelled to yield as to the other two amendments, it being stated, as is known to everyone, that the Government of the United States has not been in the habit of renting houses for our ministers abroad. It was also stated that the additional consul provided for in the bill was not needed, because these was no hardeness.

cause there was no business there of any account for him to do.

Mr. HOAR. What is the title, may I ask the Senator, that is
given to Cuba? What is the title of the bill? Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republic of Cuba. Mr. HOAR. Is the American flag to be hauled down there, I ask the Senator?

Mr. CULLOM. The American flag will probably be hauled

down when a government is set up.

Mr. HOAR. I thought we never hauled it down when it was

once put up.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask for the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate agree to the

report?-The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twelve minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13, 1902.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Gordon Paddock, of New York, now secretary of legation at that place, to be secretary of legation and consul-general of the United States at Seoul, Korea, from July 1, 1902, to fill an original vacancy. CONSULS.

Henry H. Morgan, of Louisiana, now consul at Aarau, to be consul of the United States at Lucerne, Switzerland, from July

1, 1902, to fill an original vacancy. Benjamin Johnston, of Iowa, now consul at Utilla, to be consul of the United States at Ceiba, Honduras, from July 1, 1902, to

fill an original vacancy.

Samuel S. Lyon, of New Jersey, now consulat Osaka and Hiogo,
Japan, to be consul of the United States at Kobe, Japan, from

July 1, 1902, to fill an original vacancy.

Alfred K. Moe, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Tegucigalpa, Honduras, vice Frederick H. Allison, resigned. William Martin, of New York, now consul at Ching Kiang, China, to be consul of the United States at Nanking, China, from

July 1, 1902, to fill an original vacancy.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

Hugh Pitcairn, of Pennsylvania, now consul at that place, to be consul-general of the United States at Hamburg, Germany,

be consul-general of the United States at Hamburg, Germany, from July 1, 1902, to fill an original vacancy.

Soren Listoe, of Minnesota, now consul at that place, to be consul-general of the United States at Rotterdam, Netherlands, from July 1, 1902, to fill an original vacancy.

James H. Worman, of New York, now consul at that place, to be consul-general of the United States at Munich, Bavaria, from July 1, 1902, to fill an original vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Frank G. F. Wadsworth, of Massachusetts, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Joseph W. Congdon, retired.

First Lieut. Walter S. Howland, of Massachusetts, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Aaron D. Littlefield, retired.

First Lieut. Alexander P. R. Hanks, of Wisconsin, to be a cap-tain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Robert M. Clark, retired.

First Lieut. William H. Cushing, of New York, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Louis N. Stodder, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Capt. James B. Goe, Thirteenth Infantry, to be major, April 15,

Capt. James B. Goe, Thirteenth Infantry, to be major, April 15, 1902, vice Huston, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.
Capt. Hunter Liggett, Fifth Infantry, to be major, May 5, 1902, vice Wittich, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.
First Lieut. Henry M. Dichmann, Seventh Infantry, to be captain (subject to examination required by law), April 15, 1902, vice Goe, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.
First Lieut. Halstead Dorey, Fourth Infantry, to be captain, May 5, 1902, vice Liggett, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Post Q. M. Sergt. Staley A. Campbell, United States Army, to be second lieutenant, Feb. 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Clarence Hale, of Portland, Me., to be United States district judge for the district of Maine, vice Nathan Webb, resigned, to take effect July 1, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 13, 1902.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Hill Hastings, of Kentucky, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 29, 1902.

Asst. Surg. Claude H. Lavinder, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 27, 1902.

Asst. Surg. Taliaferro Clark, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 27, 1902.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William E. Bundy, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Ohio.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Loronzo R. Thomas, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

George A. Robethan, of Pocatello, Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Blackfoot, Idaho.

INDIAN AGENT.

Caleb B. Jackson, of South Dakota, to be agent for the Indians of the Sisseton Agency in South Dakota.

TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICES.

J. L. Pancoast, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

Frank E. Gillette, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

James K. Beauchamp, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

POSTMASTERS.

William D. Ingram, to be postmaster at Lincoln, in the county of Placer and State of California.

George J. McCabe, to be postmaster at Bisbee, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona.

W. J. Hill, to be postmaster at Salinas, in the county of Monterey and State of California.

Shelley Inch, to be postmaster at Placerville, in the county of Eldorado and State of California.

Charles G. Chamberlain, to be postmaster at Pacific Grove, in the county of Monterey and State of California.

Henry Osterheld, to be postmaster at Yonkers, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Arthur J. Hudson, to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona.

Dick M. Kirby, to be postmaster at Palatka, in the county of Putnam and State of Florida.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 13, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and ap-

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference

report.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will read.
Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if this is a conference report on what is known as the omnibus claims

Mr. MAHON. The omnibus bill. Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a point of

order against the conference report at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read instead of the report. The statement explains everything

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the reading of the report be omitted, and that the statement only be read. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire that the statement and report be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama objects. The Clerk will read both the report and the statement.

The report of the committee of conference was read, as follows:

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama objects. The Clerk will read both the report and the statement.

The report of the committee of conference was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 857) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 8 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 15 and 18, insert the following:

"To Charles M. Flower, Frank S. Flower, William Flower, and D. Sprigg Flower, children of Charles H. Flower, deceased, of Rapides Parish, \$23,55."

On page 10 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 18 and 18, "To William S. Tildon, of Harford County, \$3,03."

On page 14 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 23 and 24, insert the following:

"To John W. Hanceke, of Iron County, \$1,200."

On page 14 of said Senate amendment, between lines numbered 17 and 18, insert the following:

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250.

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250."

"To William S. Tildon, of Marford County, \$1,00."

On page 30 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 22, strike out t

On page 92 of said Senate amendment, in line numbered 11, strike out "M. M. Defrees, of Indianapolis, Ind.," and insert in lieu thereof "the State of Indiana."

Indiana."

On page 92 of said Senate amendment, in lines numbered 22, 23, and 24, strike out the words "eight thousand three hundred and five dollars and thirty-eight cents, that being," and insert in lieu thereof the words "five thousand dollars, that being in lieu of."

On page 101 of said Senate amendment strike out lines numbered 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and on page 102 of said Senate amendment strike out lines numbered 1, 2, and 3.

And the Senate agree to the same.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL, 1902.

Amount of bill as passed by the House. Net increase by the Senate.	\$213,165.51 2,929,252.09
---	------------------------------

Amount of bill passed by the Senate of \$2,929,252.09, the House has agreed to \$2,451,746.60, and the Senate has receded from \$477,505.49, making the total of the bill, direct appropriation, as agreed to in conference, \$2,664,552.11.

THAD. M. MAHON,
HENRY R. GIBSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
H. M. TELLER,
WM. E. MASON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The Clerk proceeded to read the statement, as follows:

Statement to accompany conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if it is not proper to make the point of order against the report before the statement is read?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can reserve his point of

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I reserve the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is the point of order against the report or against the statement?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The point of order is against the report. The SPEAKER. It will have to be made at this time. If the point is well taken, the statement will not be read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I have to make against this report of the conferees is that the conferees have proposed amendments that had not been committed to them by either House, and not germane to the subject of difference be-

tween the two Houses.

Now, the facts in reference to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, are these: This bill originally passed the House carrying a number of claims known as the Bowman Act claims. It went to the Senate, and the Senate struck out the entire House bill after the enacting clause and added two amendments. The second amendment is immaterial, because it only relates to the title of the bill. So that, as the bill stands before the House, it practically stands as one Senate amendment. In that amendment proposed by the Senate it reinserted the Bowman Act claims as passed by the House, and then, in addition to those claims, a number of other claims, a number of claims providing for the payment of the Selfridge Board findings, a number of claims in reference to the payment of State debts, and a number of private claims.

payment of State debts, and a number of private claims.

The House, after considering the bill with the Senate amendments in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, added one amendment to the Senate amendment, and then when the bill came back from the Committee of the Whole into the House the House nonconcurred in all the Senate amendments and sent the bill to conference. After the bill reached the conference there were a number of changes made in the bill, After the bill reached the many of them germane to the subject-matter of the differences between the two Houses, but in a comparison of the two billsthat is, the original House bill as it passed the House and the bill known as the Senate amendment as it passed the Senate—I find that the conferees have inserted certain items of appropriation that are neither in the bill as it passed the House nor in the Senate amendment.

In other words, it was not in either document that was sent by either House or Senate to the conferees. But before stating these claims I will say that the conferees have stated in their report what these changes are, but have not stated that they were in neither bill. Therefore I call the attention of the Chair to the fact. One item neither in the House nor Senate bill, as stated in the conference report on page 8 of the Senate amendment, between lines 15 and 16, is the following:

To Charles M. Flower, Frank S. Flower, William Flower, and D. Sprigg Flower, children of Charles H. Flower, deceased, of Rapides Parish, \$23,357. Again they insert the claim:

To Henry R. Walton, administrator of John Walton, deceased, of Anne Arundel County, \$5,083.

Then they insert:

To John W. Hancock, of Iron County, \$1,160.

I will state that that claim was inserted by the Committee of

the Whole in the House. The other claims were not. Then I also find the claim:

To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250. That was not considered by either body; and

To Mary E. O. Dashiell, late of Norfolk County, \$810.

So I do not think there is any dispute between us, and I would like the gentleman to correct me if the statement I have made is not correct. I have carefully compared the two bills, and find nowhere in the original bill any of these items. Is not that cor-

Mr. MAHON. The Flower claim and the Walton claim are in

the original bill as it passed the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to speak louder so that the Chair can hear what he says.

Mr. MAHON. The Flower claim and the Walton claim were

in the bill as it passed the House, and were stricken out by the Senate. I will explain that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no question between us in reference to the fact that there are claims inserted in this bill neither in the House bill as it passed the House nor in the Senate amendment as it passed the Senate, and have been put into the bill by

the conferees. Now, the point that I make is that the only questions that were legitimately before the conferees on this bill were matters that were in dispute between the House and the Senate; that the conferees had no control of and no right to insert matter that was in neither report. Now, I propose, Mr. Speaker, to call the Chair's attention to a ruling of Speaker Carlisle that was made in the Forty-eighth Congress.

The House passed a bill to make appropriations for river and harbor improvements. That bill went to the Senate, and after reaching the Senate all the text of that bill was stricken out except the enacting clause. The Senate then inserted various items of appropriation for river and harbor improvements. The bill came back to the House, was nonconcurred in, and a conference was ordered. The conferees in that instance changed some of the text of the bill. I have been unable to find the original bill and amendments. I therefore can not tell from this decision of Speaker Carlisle whether or not the changes made by the conferees was as to new matter or whether it was not as to new matter and what was germane to the text of the bill. I call the Speaker's attention to this question first before giving the decisions that I rely on to sustain the point of order, because it may seem that the decision of Speaker Carlisle might be against the proposition that I assert. Mr. Carlisle in announcing his decision

The House passed a bill to provide for the improvement of rivers and harbors and making an appropriation for that purpose. That bill was sent to the Senate, where it was amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a different proposition in some respects, but a proposition having the same object in view. When that came back to the House it was treated, and properly so, as one single amendment and not as a series of amendments, as was contended for by some gentlemen on the floor at the time. It was nonconcurred in by the House and a conference was appointed upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. That conference committee having met, reports back the Senate amendment as a single amendment with various amendments, and recommends that it be concurred in with the other amendments which the committee has incorporated in its report. The question, therefore, is not whether the provisions to which the gentleman from Illinois alludes are germane to the Senate amendment which the House but whether they are germane to the Senate amendment which the House had under consideration and which was referred to the committee of conference. If germane to that amendment, the point of order can not be sustained on the ground claimed by the gentleman from Illinois. The Chair thinks they are germane to the Senate amendment, for though different from the provisions contained in the Senate amendment they relate to the same subject; and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Now, Mr. Carlisle there determines that these amendments re-

Now, Mr. Carlisle there determines that these amendments related to the same subject. I do not take it that he meant in rendering that decision that they related to the general scope of the bill, a bill for river and harbor improvement, but that they related to the particular items or subjects in which the amendment For instance, an appropriation for the Tennessee River might be amended and be germane, but a new appropria-tion for the Tennessee River, not in the Senate amendment, would not have been germane and would not have properly been before the conferees. If Mr. Carlisle decided the question on the other point, that the conferees in a general bill of this class, a bill relating to rivers and harbors, was open to any amendment that the conferees saw fit to insert in the bill, then I say it would be a very dangerous decision, Mr. Speaker, and one that the Chair and the House should not follow. That is the only decision that I can House should not follow. That is the only decision that I can find anywhere that would relate to amendments of this kind being inserted in the bill.

But we have a more recent ruling, a stronger ruling on this proposition, and one that, it seems to me, clearly in point, made by Mr. Blaine when Speaker of this House. I will read to the Chair. It is section 1415 of Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents:

On April 19, 1871, Mr. Henry L. Dawes, of Massachusetts, from the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House No. 19 (deficiency appropriations), submitted a report thereon in writing.

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order that the report contained matter not a subject of difference between the two Houses, Mr. Holman specified that there were incorporated in the report two propositions which were new—a provision making appropriations for the Suro Tunnel and another for the Agricultural Department. These matters, he submitted, were not referred to the committee of conference at all. He understood that the committee of conference was not authorized to consider matters which had been neither incorporated in Senate amendments nor brought before the House.

The Speaker said:

matters which had been neither incorporated in Senate amendments nor brought before the House.

The Speaker said:

The rule is as broad as the gentleman from Indiana states it, with this reservation—new propositions may be introduced, but there must be something in the bill to make them germane as amendments. The power of a conference committee which, as gentlemen well know, the two Houses have been in the habit of considerably enlarging fairly includes the power to incorporate germane amendments. If the gentleman from Indiana makes the point that the amendments he specifies are not germane, the Chair will examine the question, but the mere fact that the propositions embrace matters which were not originally before the House or Senate would not be sufficient to require them to be ruled out.

After further debate, during which it was shown that the Sutro-tunnel appropriation was not in the bill when it went to conference, but, as Mr. Dawes stated, was put in to reconcile the Senate conferees to the striking out of an appropriation for the Carson mint, the Speaker said:

The point of order lies against the conference report, but during the experience of the Chair on this floor he has never known a conference report ruled out on a point of order. The report of a conference committee is always received as embodying the conclusions of both Houses, or the representatives of both branches of Congress. The Chair will therefore submit the point of order to the House.

The point of order, being put to the House, was sustained by a vote of 82 ayes to 33 noes.

Now, there is another decision by Speaker Reed which I desire

Now, there is another decision by Speaker Reed which I desire to read, which will be found in paragraph 1417 of Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents:

mentary Precedents:

On June 20, 1898, Mr. Joseph W. Babcock, of Wisconsin, submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6148) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company and the Maryland and Washington Railway, etc.

Mr. William P. Hefburn, of Iowa, made the point of order that the committee of conference had inserted matter over which it had no jurisdiction. A Senate amendment had proposed to extend to other roads a privilege enjoyed by one. The conferees had added an amendment striking out this extension of privilege to others and also taking away the privilege enjoyed by the one.

During the debate it was urged on the one side that the conferees had jurisdiction only on the subject of the disagreeing votes, and that the repeal of this privilege was not in disagreement. On the other hand, it was argued that the Senate had introduced the subject-matter by their amendment, and that it was proper for the conferees to amend it.

The Speaker (Mr. Reed), sustaining the point of order, said:

"If we were to adopt the idea that when once the subject-matter was introduced, that was to control, and not the difference between the two bodies, we should be likely to enlarge the powers of the committee of conference over and beyond what was intended by the House. To the Chair it seems the point of order is well taken, and therefore the Chair sustains it."

Now Mr. Speaker whatever may be said of Mr. Carlisle's

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever may be said of Mr. Carlisle's former ruling in reference to a river and harbor bill—and I do not think that ruling would sustain the insertion of these items in the bill—clearly Mr. Reed's decision, that the only point that should be held in order is the question of differences between the two Houses, is sustained by the logic and reason of the situation. We can find parliamentary decisions on almost every point and looking in every direction; but in order to come to a clear and fair conception of the rule and to render a decision that will fairly guard the interests of the House in this matter, we must

consider it from the standpoint of what is intended by the House.

We adopt rules in the House, Mr. Speaker, not to limit the
membership of the House in the transaction of public business,
but in order to guide and guard the legislation that comes before Congress. We require that all bills and all other matters brought before Congress shall first be carried to a committee and considered there, in order that they may be carefully digested before being brought up in the House. That is the object of having a rule that a point of order can be made against an amendment that is not germane to a matter already considered by the committee. For the same reason the House adopted this rule in reference to conferees. The purpose and object of appointing a conference committee is not that it may report legislation.

There is but one object intended by the House and by the rules in appointing a conference committee, and that is to effect a compromise by which the two Houses may unite in a conclusion which might not be otherwise attained. And when you broaden that rule, when you go outside of that rule, when you extend the powers of the conferees beyond that one proposition, Mr. Speaker, you carry the House into an unknown sea of legislation where we can not be protected in the days at the close of the session when legislation is "rushed," and when we must rely absolutely on the reports of conference committees. The only thing that can safeguard the House is to hold strictly to the rule as Mr. Reid laid it down in the Fifty-fifth Congress—that the conferees must be held to the differences that existed between the two Houses,

and not be allowed to enter upon new legislation.

Now, there is no dispute in this case. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself are agreed on the facts. The conferees have taken this bill into conference and inserted matter that was unknown either in the Claims Committee of the House or the

Claims Committee of the Senate-matter reported by neither body and which was never considered by the Senate and House of Representatives.

That being the case, I think the Chair should sustain the point of order, should reject this conference report, and hold the con-

ferees strictly to the points of difference between the two Houses. It may be argued that this is an omnibus claims bill, and that therefore the conferees can insert new matter. But if the House goes to the point of holding that when you bring in an omnibus bill for the erection of public buildings or for river and harbor improvements or for claims, anything which is germane to the general subject-matter-in a claims bill anything relating to the payment of claims against the Government, or in a river and harbor bill anything relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors, or in an omnibus public-building bill anything that is germane to that general subject—then the House and the committees of the House absolutely lose control of the subject-matter. You make the conferees the legislating committee with all the power of the conference report behind them, giving them special privileges and precedence over everything in the House to put through legislation, and with the temptation to members who

have claims already in the bill—
The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Alabama suspend a moment? The Chair is not clear as to what items the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Pennsylvania are agreed upon as being new items. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania as referring to the same items which are referred to by the gentleman from Alabama. Are the items numbered in the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The items are not numbered in the bill;

they are specified in the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman give the number of the items in the conference report?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are not numbered; I shall have to

read them by name.

Mr. PAYNE. Has the conference report been printed in the

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is in the RECORD of the Senate proceedings of May 5.
Mr. PAYNE. What page?
Mr. UNDERWOOD. Page

Page 5381.

The first item to which I refer the Chair is— To John W. Hancock, of Iron County, \$1,160.

This was inserted in the Committee of the Whole when the bill was in the House, but was not put in by the House. The House rejected the entire Senate amendment and nonconcurred in the whole matter, and therefore, although that claim was considered in Committee of the Whole, it was never in difference or dispute between the two Houses.

I refer also to this item.

To William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250.

There is no dispute whatever between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself as to whether this was in or out. He admits it was never in either bill. Also to Mary E. O. Dashiell, late of Nortwas never in either bill. Also to Mary E. O. Dashiell, late of Norfolk County, \$810. Some of the other items that I thought were not in the bill the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Mahon] claims were in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair understands there are two items, that of John W. Hancock, of Iron County, \$1,160, and that of William B. Horner, late of Shelby County, \$1,250.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thought the other items were not in either bill but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Mahon]

either bill, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Mahon] corrects me on that. We both agree on these two items and that the point of order would affect one just as much as the other, so there is no use of discussing the question as to whether the other items are in or out. Now, as I said, the only good reason in the world that we could give to hold that these items are germane—it is not a dispute that they were a difference between the two House would be to hold they are germane to the whole subject-matter of the bill. There is no other item in the bill to which they relate. They did not relate in any way, then, to any other particular item in this bill. The only way that they could be held germane and therefore a subject of conference would be to hold they are germane, because the title of this bill is a general claims bill, and you would therefore be entitled to put in any claims on earth against the Government of the United States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose the House and Senate adopted this report, after full consideration of both Houses, what fundamental objection is there to that operation? Is not that

and would that not be legal legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not think it is proper legislation for the House and the Senate to put matters in in conference that have not been considered by both Houses.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Suppose the House and Senate each considered the new items after the conferees had put them in the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, but that is not the proposition be-

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is just what we are doing now, as I understand it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Neither the House nor the Senate has considered the proposition.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We will do that in the House now if given a chance. We can now see whether they are good or bad claims. Certainly the regular practice is better, indeed the

Mr. ROBB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in regard to the Hancock claim, that it appeared from the showing here before the Committee of the Whole House that that was a claim that was before the Committee on War Claims and was overlooked and was inserted here by a unanimous vote of the House when that bill was pending before the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman I have stated

that fact to the Chair.

Mr. ROBB. That certainly amounts to an instruction to the

committee on conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not making a point against this particular claim. I do not know but the claim may be a very just one. It is the report that I am making the point of order against. If those claims were legitimately before the House, I would probably vote for both of them. I would not say they are good or bad, but the point that I am making is that they are not properly a subject of conference, and the conferees have exceeded their powers in making this report—that therefore no report has

been made to this House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble about this matter. The conferees acted entirely within their scope. In relation to this point of order, the conferees of the House and of the Senate examined the parliamentary law on this subject very carefully, and there is no disposition to put anything into this bill simply because it is a claims bill. The bill was sent from the House to the Senate, and the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted one amendment, which amendment was in paragraphs. The first 20 pages of that amendment relate entirely to the Bowman Act cases—cases that have been sent from this House to the Court of Claims and have been returned to the Speaker and the President of the Senate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they are claims here on the Calendar of this House. One was for William B. Horner, of \$1,250. He is an old soldier, a man who is now up in the eighties, as I am told. He has fought his claim through the Court of Claims, and has been at it for ten years, and finally got a verdict of \$1,100. The other one returned was the Hancock claim. That is a Bowman Act claim of the same class as was in the Senate amendment for some \$1,100. Now, I am told that he is a very old man. The other is for an old lady. Now, these are the only three matters. There is nothing in this conference report except what was in the House bill as it went to the Senate and in the Senate amendment as it came back to the House.

The SPEAKER. To which bill does the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. To the Hancock and Horner claims.

The SPEAKER. Which was the one that was in the House

Mr. MAHON. Charles Flower in the House bill, and Henry Walton.

The SPEAKER. Was the Hancock Mr. MAHON. No, sir, Mr. MAHON. Was the Horner bill in the House bill? Was the Hancock bill in the House bill?

Mr. MAHON. No, san.
The SPEAKER. Was the Horner on in the Mr. MAHON. No, sir.
The SPEAKER. Was the Dashiell bill in the House bill?
Mr. MAHON. No, sir.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.
Mr. GROSVENOR. Were they put in in the Senate? Now, Mr. Speaker, we consulted about this, and out of sympathy for these old people, their claims having come in, and there being only three of them, if they had been younger people probably the conferees would not have put them in. They were added to that part of the amendment that related to the Bowman Act claims from the Court of Claims, and were on that subject alone. Now let me read you a decision of this House:

Although the Senate had amended a bill of the House by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a different proposition in some respects, yet having the same object in view, the question presented was not whether the provisions excepted to in the conference report were germane to the original House bill, but whether they were germane to the Senate amendments. In the opinion of the Chair, they were clearly germane; for though different from the provisions contained in such amendment, they related directly to the same subjects—

Just as these are Bowman Act cases-

and under the common parliamentary law and practice might be made, by way of amendment, a substantially different proposition from that originally passed by the House.

You will find that in the RECORD of the Forty-ninth Congress, page 7932. So I might quote decision after decision. conferees had under consideration that part of the amendment in relation to the Bowman Act claims. We struck some out that we thought perhaps ought not to be in, and we inserted these three, exactly on the same subject, in the same part of the amendment, relating to the Bowman Act cases. There is no question but what they are germane to that amendment.

Now, the gentleman talks about appropriating for Tennessee in the river and harbor bill. Of course you could not amend that amendment by putting one in for another State. They are different subjects; but here is the paragraph in this bill relating to the Bowman Act cases, and the conferees after long consideration put them in, not to take any advantage of the House. They were perfectly fair about it, and they put them in simply because they were germane to that amendment, being the same subject-matter, although not in the original bill as it left the House, or in the Senate amendment. I do not think there is any use taking up time. I thought it was understood, or they would not have gone in. We were satisfied they were germane to the paragraph of the bill. All of the decisions are on that line, that where they are not in the House bill and where they are not in the Senate amendment, yet if they are germane and on the same subject under consideration, it has been held that you could put them in. and the Speakers of the House have so decided.

I will not quote the other decisions. They are all in the same

line.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit to the consideration of the Chair a precedent that seems to me to be on all fours with the case now before the House. It is found in the Congressional Globe of the Thirty-eighth Congress, on page 1402, and is digested in Hinds's Manual of Parliamentary Precedents, on page 745, section 1420. In that case the House passed the bill. It went to the Senate. The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause and put in a bill of its own. It came back to the House and was nonconcurred in. Conferees were appointed, and the conferees agreed upon an entirely new bill, containing matter that was not at all contained in the original bill. On it coming again before the House on the report of the conferees, the question of order was raised by Mr. Holman, of Indiana, that the report did not come within the scope of the conference committee, that the conference committee had substituted an entirely new bill, and that so to do was entirely without their jurisdiction. Speaker Colfax on the question of order ruled as follows:

The Chair understands that the Senate adopted a substitute for the House bill. If the two Houses had agreed upon any particular language or any part of a section, the committee of conference could not change that; but the Senate having stricken out the bill of the House and inserted another

Which is exactly our case—

the committee of conference have the right to strike out that and report a substitute in its stead. Two separate bills having been referred to the committee, they can take either one of them or a new bill entirely or a bill embracing part of either. They have a right to report any bill that is germane to the bills referred to them.

An appeal was then taken from this decision and it was sustained—yeas 80, nays 35.

I submit to the Chair that that precedent is absolutely con-

clusive of the question now before the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule on the question, and is impressed with the importance of it. There are but few countries, as the Chair now recalls, that have conference committees in their national legislative bodies, certainly none that have perfected them as we have in the United States. It is one of the vital instrumentalities in bringing the two Houses together and securing joint legislation. But there must be no abuse of that power. It will not do to allow matters not in contemplation that power. It will not do to allow matters not in contemplation by the two Houses, that are foreign to the questions being considered, to be inserted by the conference committee.

The decisions here are conflicting. The one just referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Gibson], in reference to the Freedmen's Bureau, is "the widest open," so to speak, of the decisions; and yet in that case the new bill treated of the subjectmatter of the original propositions, which was how to handle the interests of the freedmen, and one can readily see that the Chair might allow that to come in without being a violation of the

Now, what are the facts in this particular case? We have incorporated here, according to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in charge of the bill, three entirely new items, not known to the action of the House, not considered in the action of the Senate. One is the Hancock item, which we find was known as Senate bill 52, and in the House as House bill 11208; another is the Horner item, known as H. R. 12590, and the other the Dashiaell item, known as H. R. 13223, entirely separate and distinct bills, presenting different rights and different questions for the consideration of the Congress. Now, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania, in his ingenious argument, seeks to avoid the force of the objection made by the gentleman from Alabama because they were claims. But there are different claims. The House might be well pleased to insert and allow one claim and wholly opposed to another claim, and for the conference committee to step into outside matters, not before it by the action of the two Houses, and bring in a new claim that had never been considered by either House on the ground of its being germane, it seems to the Chair would open a very dangerous pathway to unwise legislation.

Now, while the Chair believes that the conference committee is a great instrumentality to bring the two Houses together, still the Chair would be very loath to open the door to allow any con-

ference committee to usurp the prerogatives of either House; and while he has examined with care the several decisions, the weight of authority is in the line of his own feelings on this question; and even when submitted to a vote of the House, as was done in one case, the House sustained the views of the objecting party,

Judge Holman.

The Chair is strongly of the opinion that to secure wise legisla-tion caution should be observed in not allowing abuse of the powers of the conference committee, and this view invites sustaining the point of order in this case. The functions of a conference committee are such that they must consider a matter laid before them by the Congress. If it involves an amount of money they may increase it or cut it down; they may put limitations upon it. The functions of a conference committee are great and can be of infinite benefit to the House of Representatives. The feeling of the Chair is, then, that the door should not be opened beyond the scope and purpose of a conference committee. That is clear; and the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama. Therefore that brings us to the next thing for consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker-The SPEAKER. Let the Chair conclude.

Where does this leave this conference report? It has to be treated as a whole. The point of order defeats the conference report just exactly as if it were rejected by the House. That has already been held in one case—I think by Mr. Speaker Reed—that a point of order sustained against a conference report is equivaa point of order sustained against a conference report is equiva-lent to a rejection of the report by the House of Representatives on a vote. And it seems to the Chair that is where this confer-ence report now stands.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the Speaker, I do not feel disposed to let this matter rest with the

judgment of one man in the House. I am well satisfied that these matters are germane, and therefore I most respectfully appeal

from the decision of the Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move to lay that appeal on the table. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania appeals from the decision of the Chair, and the gentleman from Alabama moves to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. MAHON. In due time I will make another motion, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw the appeal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania with-

draws his appeal. Mr. MAHON.

raws his appeal.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker—
The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend for a moment?
After a pause.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania.
Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for another conference.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to [After a pause.] Mr. MAHON.

further insist and ask for a conference.

motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman, if I may, touching the provision of the conference report which has I may, touching the provision of the conference report which has been rejected, and is supposed germane to the Senate amendment, touching the Nevada claims, so called. I have just returned after an absence of some ten days, and this morning for the first time saw what was proposed. I have given it a hasty reading, and, in my judgment, in light of legislation that was had upon the urgent deficiency bill, I am inclined to think that legislation along the line of establishing an absolutely unfair precedent. It is the legality of the so-called Nevada claim, and any precedent would open the door for many hundreds of millions of dollars of claims for the various States, for bounties, extra pay, etc., paid by the States. by the States.

Now, I hope it shall not be necessary when this report comes back to antagonize the conference report. It is a question on which, as one member of the House, I am not in favor of—any legislation that would commit the United States where it is not now committed. We have had legislation to remove the statute of limitation, which we have done at this session of Congress, and I ask the gentleman if it will be necessary to offer a resolu-

Mr. MAHON. Let me explain to the gentleman.
Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. There was only this Territory of Nevada. This money was expended for sending troops to the front, just the same as was done in Illinois, Ohio, and all the other States. Now, New York made an effort, and succeeded in establishing the proposition, that under the act of 1861, where the Secretary of War

osition, that under the act of 1861, where the Secretary of War authorized the borrowing of money to put troops into the field, and they issued their bonds for the same, that the interest of those bonds was to be an obligation against the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. MAHON. So that Pennsylvania secured hers, and in the last urgent deficiency bill a section was included for the benefit of the other States, and under this general section their claims are referred to the Secretary of War, there to be adjudicated under the principle laid down by the United States Supreme Court in the case of New York against the United States.

in the case of New York against the United States.

Now, if Nevada had been a State at the time this money was expended, she would not need this legislation; but she was at that time a Territory. The clause that the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Appropriation Committee, put in would cover the State of Nevada exactly, but she was not, as I say, a State. She was brought into the Union a short time after the money had been expended and her troops put into the field. Under the call of 1861 she issued \$100,000 worth of bonds and sent 1,180 men into the Army of the United States, exactly as did other States, although she was then a Territory. These bonds are still unpaid. Although under the law of 1861 the States were paid the principal or face of the bond, Nevada was not paid because the set did not include Territories. cause the act did not include Territories.

Nevada asked for a direct appropriation of \$424,000. We did not know what it was for, but if she borrowed that money, having issued her bonds under the call of the Secretary of War, then she ought to be treated the same as any other State although a Territory. As I say, if Nevada had been a State at the time she issued the bonds she would be covered by the clause in the urgent deficiency bill. This section is simply drawn to put the Territory of Nevada on all fours with the other States of this Union. This does not establish a precedent; it does not effect any other State. It puts Nevada on the same footing as any other State in the

Union.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do the States get payment without being

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The State of Nevada was brought into the Union after the war; brought in for a purpose, so that we might have sufficient votes to adopt amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have the act of 1861 and 1862, and I also have before me the legislation of this session of Congress, which seems to me

is pretty broad:

And the claims of like character arising under the act of Congress of July 27, 1861 (12 Stat., p. 276), and joint resolution of March 8, 1862 (12 Stat., p. 615), as interpreted and applied by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of State of New York v. The United States, decided January 6, 1896 (160 U. S. Rep., p. 588), not heretofore allowed, or heretofore disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury, shall be reopened, examined, and allowed, and if deemed necessary shall be transmitted to the Court of Claims for findings of fact or determination of disputed questions of law, to aid in the settlement of claims by the accounting officers.

Now, then I understand the gentleman to say that Newada at

Now, then, I understand the gentleman to say that Nevada at

the time of this expenditure was a Territory. Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And that therefore the acts of 1861 and 1862 did not apply to the Territory of Nevada; that the object of the clause in the conference report which has gone out on a point of order was to place the present State of Nevada exactly in the same condition that New York and other States are in under the act of 1861 and the joint resolution of 1862, and to pay that State for expenditures made by the Territory precisely for the same class of claims, and no other, that the other States are entitled to payment for. I understand that to be the position of the gentle-

Mr. MAHON. Yes. Now, will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to read the amendment in full? It is as follows:

That the claim of the State of Nevada for costs, charges, and expenses incurred by the Territory of Nevada for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to suppress the insurrection against the United States, war of 1861-1865, under the act of Congress of July 27, 1861 (12 Stats., p. 276), and joint resolution of March 8, 1882 (12 Stats., 615), as interpreted and applied by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the State of New York against the United States, decided January 6, 1896 (160 U. S. Reports, p. 598), not here-tofore allowed or disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury, shall be examined, allowed, and paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Now, that exactly follows the clause in the urgent deficiency

bill except the concluding part.

Mr. CANNON. No; the gentleman has got something in there

that is not in the report.

Mr. MAHON. I quoted it exactly from the urgent deficiency bill except the concluding part.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman puts in something that is not in the act, namely: The act that applied to the other States reads as follows:

Shall be reopened, examined, and allowed, and if deemed necessary shall be transmitted to the Court of Claims for findings of fact or determinations of disputed questions of law to aid in the settlement of the claims by the accounting officers.

Now, then, by the clause in the urgent deficiency bill which I have just read Congress keeps the whip hand. The accounting officers are only authorized to adjust the accounts of the States in the light of the New York decision, and they must certify to Congress for its information.

Now, the gentleman leaves out the Court of Claims, and in addition to that the gentleman proceeds "and paid out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." In other words, Congress loses the whip hand. I want to say to the gentleman that I fear, in the light of the act of 1882 that was passed touching Nevada, Texas, Kansas, and some other States, under which there was an adjudication and payment to Nevada, as well as to the other States, I am fearful, in the light of that subsequent decision, from a hasty examination, that this legislation may give, by legislative construction, something to Nevada that has been denied to the other States.

Illinois, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and other States, many of them, if not all, paid from \$100 to \$500 bounty. Massachusetts gave as extra pay to all her soldiers in the war of the rebellion almost as much as they received from the Federal Government. Now, those bounties and that extra pay have never been reimbursed by the United States. In the light of what has passed, I am afraid the gentleman from Pennsylvania has got this provision broad enough to repay to the State of Nevada the

mr. MAHON. Did your State as a State pay bounties, or were the bounties paid by the municipalities?

Mr. CANNON. I think the bounties were paid by the State; but I am not sure about that.

Mr. MAHON. Your State paid \$50 bounty.
Mr. CANNON. Now, if the Territory of Nevada was not covered by the act of 1861-62, I am perfectly willing that there should be legislation so covering it, although I believe that the State of Nevada, under an adjudication which has been made, has already been paid all that she is entitled to, unless she is entitled to something for interest.

Now, if the gentleman has the same object in view that I have,

Now, if the gentleman has the same object in view that I have, there can be no dispute between us.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly not.

Mr. CANNON. But I fear that the provision of this conference report may do something which on fuller examination will prove to be what the gentleman is not designing to do.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say to the gentleman that under that amendment the State of Nevada can not get a dollar beyond what was allowed to the State of New York by the decision which has been referred to. If Nevada did not make expenditures of the kind referred to in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, she gets nothing.

States, she gets nothing.

Mr. CANNON. Under the act of 1861-62?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. There has never been a case in the history of this Government where the Government ever appealed from the decision of an accounting officer. I do not think the gentleman can cite such a case.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, there have been a great many cases where the action of the accounting officer has been absolutely repudi-

ated.

Mr. MAHON. I believe in every such case it was the State

that made the appeal. It was with the view of protecting the Government that this provision was framed as it is.

Mr. CANNON. I want to put the State of Nevada on all fours with the State of New York under the legislation of 1861-62 and under the decision of the case of New York v. The United States If Nevada is not on all fours with New York, I am willing and desirous of putting her in that position; but there I want to stop.

Mr. MAHON. Well, we shall have no trouble about that

matter.

Mr. CANNON. I am perfectly willing to treat the Territory of Nevada in the same manner as if she had been a State.

My eye has just fallen upon the provision in reference to this matter. When this conference meets again from time to time members of the House may desire to present something for the gentleman's consideration or for the consideration of the committee; and I am perfectly willing not to embarrass him, because from what he says—and I have always found him a man of his word—there appears to be no difference between him and myself as to what is desirable in this legislation.

Mr. MAHON. The only question is as to the shape in which

the provision shall be put.

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand the gentleman from Illi-

nois, he is willing to waive the statute of limitations in regard to any claim that the State of Nevada may have.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And he is willing also that the Territory of Nevada (now a State) shall be put on an equality with the various States that made these advances.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language in this report exactly tallies with the act of 1861, which provided—

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to the governor of any State, or to his duly authorized agents, the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting its troops employed in aiding to suppress the present insurrection against the United States, to be settled upon proper vouchers, to be filed and passed upon by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury.

I repeat that this conference report simply follows the language of the original act; it prescribes the same method of procedure in the presentation of claims, it follows the same method of account-

ing, it follows the same form of appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend construe that as to Nevada this money was payable in gold, and that in making reimbursement now we would have to make up for the difference between gold and greenbacks.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have no construction in regard to that.

I simply say that the provision embraced in the conference report renews the act of 1861–62, and makes it operative as to the State of Nevada (then a Territory) as it has been with reference to all

the other States

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion at this point? In point of fact, the State of Nevada on its own motion paid its own troops twice what the troops of the State of New York were paid by the United States. Now, the United States, in settling with the States for claims of this kind, has paid only in setting with the States for claims of this kind, has paid only the same sums that were paid by the United States to other sol-diers. The Government has not paid any of the bounties that various States paid to their troops, and it is the settled construc-tion under the act that no such payments are due from the United States. It take it then that my friend does not desired United States. I take it, then, that my friend does not desire that Nevada under this legislation should receive the difference between greenbacks and gold or should receive pay to the extent of double the amount that the United States paid its own soldiers. If so, my friend and myself do not agree about it, and I am merely talking about it so that if we can now by this discussion and comparison of notes in the House indicate the principles upon which this matter should be settled, it would save us perhaps great trouble when the conference report comes in for adoption.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not authorized to waive any part of the claim of the that I am not authorized to waive any part of the claim of the State of Nevada. I presume if this becomes law it will go before the accounting officers of the Treasury and will be determined by them just as the claims of other States have been. I believe that entire claim to be a just claim, and I am willing to meet the gentleman or anyone who opposes it at the proper time on the floor of this House in debate. I do not think this is, however, the time to go into all the intricacies of these claims unless the gentleman wishes to force the discussion now.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he is willing to take the substance of that provision in the urgent deficiency bill that applies to all the other States and make

it apply to the State of Nevada?

Mr. MAHON. The only change we would have to make would be to put in what is stricken out of that section in the urgent deficiency bill. We followed it except that we struck that out. If the gentleman examines the amendment, he will find that we

followed it exactly.

Mr. CANNON. He is willing to take that modification?

Mr. MAHON. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to further insist on disagreements to the amendment of the Senate and ask for a conference.

Mr. Robb rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Missouri?
Mr. MAHON. No; I can not yield.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr.

Underwood) there were—ayes 100, noes 19.

The SPEAKER. The motion prevails, and the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. Mahon, Gibson, and Sims.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask recognition to move instructions to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. That would be in order before the appoint-

ment of the conferees and after the conference had been ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the conference has been ordered. The SPEAKER. If the gentleman states that he was rising to

The SPEARER. If the gentleman states that he was rising to get the attention of the Chair, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was; I desired to move instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up his instructions.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the Clerk to take it down. I desire to move that the conference be instructed not to agree to what is known as the Selfridge board findings in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gen-

The Clerk read as follows:

That the conferees be instructed not to agree to what is known as the Selfridge board findings in the Senate amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to occupy any great space of time, but I just wish a few words.
Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.
Mr. MAHON. I make the point of order that this is not in order after the conferees have been appointed.
The SPEAKER. That part of the statement of the Chair was withdrawn on the statement that the gentleman was twing to

withdrawn on the statement that the gentleman was trying to get recognition. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the merits and demerits of the Selfridge board findings over a week ago. It

has been printed in the RECORD. I do not know that I can throw any more new light on the proposition by going into a further discussion of the question, but I wish to say this, that when we had this bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state nad this bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, considering this question of the Selfridge board findings, the House debated the question. It was considered and voted on, and by a vote on the floor of this House the House rejected the Selfridge board findings by a majority of the House. That was virtually an instruction to the conferees of the House not to agree to the Senate amendment in that particular. It may not have been a direct instruction, but it certainly amounted to

Now, with that situation staring the conferees in the face, a majority of the conferees—Mr. Sims did not sign the report—did go into conference with the Senate; did at once agree to accept the entire Senate bill, rejecting the virtual instructions of the House, bringing back this bill before the House on a unanimous conference report, where, if it had not been knocked out by a point of order, it would have been impossible for this House to take up the bill item by item and give it consideration. We have been required to vote for the bill as a whole under the report brought in here by the conference committee. Notwithstanding the fact that the House had rejected these claims, the conference committee brought them back into this House under the report just rejected on a point of order without giving the House any opportunity whatever for a separate vote in the matter. Now, I say that under those circumstances the House is justified and ought to adopt instructions directing these conferees not to agree to those Selfridge board findings. Let them come in and stand up before the Senate conferees and tell the Senate that the House is not willing to pass that portion of the bill, and then if they find they can not get the Senate to recede they can properly come back here and report the facts to the House, where we will have an opportunity to further consider these claims on their merits without being tied up with the other claims in the bill, and give them a a separate consideration.

Now, I am not going into a full discussion of the merits or demerits of the Selfridge board claims. I do not think they ought to be paid. There is no justification for them. They claim that the plans were changed, and therefore that the contractors lost money. The record does not sustain them. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury at the time and the report of Senator Grimes, chairman of the Committee on Claims of the Senate at the time, both state that there had been no change whatever in the plans and that it was merely an appeal to the generosity of Congress to pay these claims. They have been rejected for forty years, and now they come here asking you to give them between a million and a million and a half of dollars to pay claims that at the time when they were new and people understood the facts had been thoroughly digested and rejected. I therefore think that under these circumstances the House is justified in instructing the conferees, and ought to instruct the conferees in this case

not to agree to these claims.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make any reply. This matter has been discussed over and over in this House. The Senate conferees state that they will not recede under any consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.
The previous question was ordered.
The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to instruct the conferees. As many as favor the motion will say "aye;" those opposed, "no." The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. Mahon) there were—ayes 67, noes 64.

Mr. ROBERTS. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Underwood] moves that the conferees be instructed not to agree to what are known as the Selfridge claims on this bill, and on that motion the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were-yeas 112, nays 71, an-

swered "present" 20, not voting 148, as follows:

		The state of the s	
Allen, Ky. Ball, Tex. Ball, Tex. Bellamy, Beversock, Brantley, Breazeale, Bristow, Brundidge, Brukett, Butler, Mo. Caldwell, Cannon, Clark, Clayton, Cooney, Cromer, Crumpacker, Crumpacker, Cushman, Davrey, La. De Armond, Dougherty, Douglas, Driscoll, Edwards, Elliott, Flood,	Foster, Ill. Fox, Gill, Glenn, Gooch, Gordon. Green.Pa. Griffith, Hay, Hemenway, Henry, Conn. Hepburn, Holliday, Hooker, Johnson, Jones, Va. Jones, Wash. Kern, Kitchin, Wm. W. Kleberg, Kluttz, Lacey, Lacey, Lacey, Lester, Lever, Lever, Lever, Lewis, Ga.	Lewis, Pa Little, Lloyd, McCulloch, McLain, Mahoney, Mann, Martin, Mercer, Mickey, Miers, Ind. Miller, Morgan, Morris, Needham, Olmsted, Overstreet, Padgett, Palmer, Parker, Pou, Powers, Me. Prince, Pugsley, Ransdell, La, Ray, N. Y. Reeder, Reeves,	Reid, Rhea, Va. Richardson, Ala. Richardson, Tenn. Rixey, Robinson, Ind. Robinson, Nebr. Rucker, Scott, Selby, Shallenberger, Shattuc, Sims, Small, Smith, Ill. Smith, Ky. Smith, Samuel W. Smith, Samuel W. Snodgrass, Spight, Stephens, Tex. Stevens, Minn. Tongue, Underwood, Weeks, Williams, Ill. Williams, Ill. Williams, Ill. Williams, Miss. Wooten.
	NA	YS-71.	

	24.	A15-11.	
cheson, lexander, illen, Me. all, Del, leidler, dakeney, trownlow, tull, butler, Pa. apron, assel, onnell, onny, oombs, ooper, Wis. reamer,	Currier, Dalzell, Davis, Fla. Dick, Evans, Fitzgerald, Fordney, Gaines, Tenn. Gibson, Gillet, N. Y. Goldfogle, Graff, Graham, Grosvenor, Hamilton, Haskins, Haugen, Hidebrant,	Joy, Ketcham, Lamb, Lessler, Lindsay, Littlefield, Long, Loudenslager, McLachlan, Mahon, Mondell, Moody, N. C. Moon, Mudd, Newlands, Otjen, Patterson, Tenn. Pearre,	Powers, Mass. Roberts, Ruppert, Russell, Ryan, Sherman, Sibley, Smith, Iowa Sparkman, Sperry, Stewart, N. Y. Sulzer, Tayler, Ohio Tirrell, Tompkins, Ohio Vreeland, Woods.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"-20.

rney,	Deemer,	Maynard,	Tate,
itell,	Grow,	Metcalf,	Trimble,
rnett,	Irwin,	Meyer, La.	Wanger,
liss,	Jackson, Kans.	Showalter,	Wheeler,
vherd,	McClellan,	Southard,	Young.
	NOM II	OMPTO TIO	

Cowner a,	mccienan,	Southaru,
	NOT V	OTING-148.
Adams, Adamson, Aplin, Babcock, Bankhead, Bartholdt, Bates, Bell, Belmont, Benton, Bingham, Bishop, Boreing, Bowie, Brick, Bromwell, Broussard, Brown, Burgess, Burk, Pa. Burleson, Burleson, Burleson, Calderhead, Candler, Cassingham,		
Cochran,	Hill, Hitt,	Nevin,
Cooper, Tex.	Hopkins,	Norton, Patterson, Pa.
Cousins, Crowley,	Howard, Howell,	Payne, Perkins,
Curtis, Dahle,	Hughes, Hull,	Pierce, Randell, Tex.
Davidson,	Jack, Jackson Md	Robb,

Dayton, De Graffenreid, Dinsmore,

Howard, Howell, Hughes, Hull, Jack, Perkins, Pierce, Randell, Tex. Robb. Jackson, Md. Robertson, La. Jenkins, Rumple, Scarborough,

Schirm, Shackleford, Shafroth, Shelden, Sheiden, Sheppard, Skiles, Slayden, Smith, Henry C. Southwick, Stark, Steele, Stewart, N. J. Storm, Sulloway, Sutherland, Swanson, Talbert, Taylor, Ala.
Thayer,
Thomas, Iowa
Thomas, N. C. Thomas, N. C. Thompson, Tompkins, N. Y. Vandiver, Van Voorhis, Wachter, Wadsworth, Wadswort Warner, Warnock, Watson, White, Wiley, Wilson,

So the instructions to the committee of conference were agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice: Mr. Henry C. Smith with Mr. Taylor of Alabama. Mr. Jack with Mr. Finley.

Mr. IRWIN with Mr. GOOCH.
Mr. DRAPER with Mr. MADDOX.
Mr. BARNEY with Mr. MCRAE.
Mr. SOUTHARD with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND with Mr. JACKSON of Kansas.

Mr. Tawney with Mr. Cowherd. Mr. Emerson with Mr. Gilbert. Mr. Steele with Mr. Cooper of Texas.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. Showalter with Mr. Slayden. Mr. Thomas of Iowa with Mr. Bankhead.

Mr. Boutell with Mr. Griggs. Mr. Skiles with Mr. Talbert.

For this session:
Mr. Young with Mr. Benton.
Mr. Kahn with Mr. Belmont.
Mr. Bromwell with Mr. Cassingham.

Mr. Bromwell with Mr. Cassingham.
Mr. Morrell with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Deemer with Mr. Mutchler.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Boreing with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Dayton with Mr. Meyer of Louisiana.
Mr. Heatwole with Mr. Tate.

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER. Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON. For this day:

Mr. HITT with Mr. DINSMORE.

Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. KEHOE.
Mr. JENKINS with Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.
Mr. McCleary with Mr. McAndrews.
Mr. Rumple with Mr. Thompson.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Claude Kitchin.
Mr. Dovener with Mr. Stark.
Mr. Shelden with Mr. Crowley.
Mr. Wachere with Mr. Drivers

Mr. Wachter with Mr. Burnett. Mr. Babcock with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Foss with Mr. BOWIE. Mr. McCall with Mr. Robertson of Louisiana.

Mr. WARNOCK with Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. BURGESS. Mr. BRICK with Mr. BURLESON Mr. Burk of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cochran, Mr. Warner with Mr. Candler.

Mr. Burleigh with Mr. De Graffenreid. Mr. Calderhead with Mr. Feely. Mr. Calderhead with Mr. Fleely.
Mr. Conner with Mr. Fleming.
Mr. Cousins with Mr. Henry of Texas.
Mr. Curtis with Mr. Jett.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Lassiter.
Mr. Esch with Mr. Latimer.
Mr. Fletcher with Mr. McDermott.

Mr. FOERDERER with Mr. NEVILLE.

Mr. HANBURY with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. Hedge with Mr. Wilson. Mr. Minor with Mr. Howard.

Mr. HILL with Mr. Robb. Mr. Hughes with Mr. Scarborough.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Shafroth. Mr. Knox with Mr. Snook. Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. THAYER.
Mr. SCHIRM with Mr. ZENOR.
Mr. LOVERING with Mr. THOMAS OF NORTH CAROlina.
Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. VANDIVER.
Mr. GARDNER OF Michigan with Mr. SHEPPARD.
Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. WHITE.
Mr. STEWART OF New Jersey with Mr. WILEY.

On this vote:

Mr. Greene of Massachusetts with Mr. Maynard.

Mr. Burton with Mr. McClellan.

Mr. Moody of Oregon with Mr. Pierce.
Mr. Moody of Oregon with Mr. Pierce.
Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I forgot for a moment that I was paired with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Tawney. I voted "yea." I desire to be recorded as "present."
The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following conferees on the bill: Mr. Mahon, Mr. Gibson, and Mr. Sims.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and pending that motion, I ask my colleague if he has any suggestion to make in reference to the limitation of time for general debate.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. There are a number of gentlemen on this side who desire to speak, and I suggest six hours on a side for general debate.

Mr. FOSS. I will say to my friend I can not use one-third of that on this side, so far as I have been able to hear from members on this side of the House, and I would suggest to him that we do not fix any limitation for the present, but go into Committee of the Whole and have general debate for the rest of the afternoon, he to control one half of the time and the chairman of the

committee to control one half of the time and the chairman of the committee to control the other half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, asks that this day be devoted to general debate, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Meyer] to control one half of the time and he the other half, this not to be understood as limiting general debate. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 14046, the naval appropriation

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.
The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the
Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. Sherman in the chair.
The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole
House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill
H. R. 14046, the title of which the Clerk will report.
The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14048) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor, on behalf of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to report and call up at this time for the consideration of the committee this bill, known as the naval appropriation bill, which makes appropriation for the resultances. appropriation bill, which makes appropriation for the maintenance of the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903. I have set forth in the report, which is available to all members of the House, an exhaustive statement as to every item appropriated in this bill, to which I will ask members of the House to make reference; and if there are any questions which any member desires to ask me in reference to the bill, either now or in the course of general debate, I will be most happy to answer them, provided they are not too difficult. But there are some general matters included in this bill which I think it wise at this time to call to

the attention of the House.

In the first place, let us consider the size of the bill. The amount carried by this bill is \$77,659,386.63. This is a decrease from the bill of last year to the amount of \$442,404.77. Now, the Committee on Naval Affairs have had under consideration for a number of months in the committee room the preparation of this bill. They have been diligently at work laboring in a measure to cut down the appropriations, providing for the economical administration of the naval establishment.

Our estimates were unusual this year. The original estimates sent here by the Navy Department at the beginning of Congress amounted to \$98,000,000. To this afterwards came supplemental estimates of a million and one-half dollars, and then additional estimates from time to time from the Secretary of the Navy amounting to five million more. So that the total estimates for the naval establishment this year coming from the Department through the regular channels to the Committee on Naval Affairs, all told, original, supplemental, and additional, amounted in all to \$105,000,000.

These estimates the committee have cut down to the extent of \$27,405,298. I may say that that fact alone is worth commenting upon, entailing, as it did, laborious consideration and the careful investigation which has been given to the subject of naval affairs

in the committee room.

Now, these reductions in the estimates were principally from public works. The estimates under the Bureau of Yards and Docks for public works called for \$20,781,375, but the committee thought it wise to reduce this and recommended appropriations to the amount of \$6,561.075, showing a decrease under the head of "Public works" in the Bureau of Yards and Docks of \$14.220.000.
Under the Bureau of Ordnance there was a decrease of \$333.000.
Under "Public works," for the Naval Academy, a decrease of \$1,000,000; under "Public works," Bureau of Ordnance, \$1.065,000; under the Bureau of Equipment, \$1,870,000; under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts a decrease of \$570,000: under the Bureau

of Construction and Repair, \$1,340,000; under the Bureau of Steam Engineering, \$300,000; under the head of "Increase of Navy," \$1,000,000. The balance of deductions is made up from reduc-

tions from supplemental and additional estimates.

The next question I wish to call to the attention of members of the committee is this: We have made provision here for more men. As everyone will see, when we are building ships it is necessary also to make provision for additional men. This matter was called to the attention of the committee by the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and by the Secretary in his annual report. Both the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and the Secretary of the Navy joined in the recommendation for 3,000 additional men, and this recommendation is made by your committee. It will be necessary, as we go on building ships, to provide, from time to time, of course, for an increased number of men and also an increased number of officers. The two go hand in hand together, and it is necessary to provide for more men in advance of the construction of ships because it takes two and three years to properly train the men so that they can successfully man the ships. Take, for instance, the ships now under construction, and it will require about 14,000 additional men to properly man them. Of this number we have already provided in the last appropriation bill for 5,000 men and this year for 3,000 more, and it will be necessary to provide for 6,000 more before the time of the completion of the ships.

Now, there is another phase of this bill which I desire to call attention of the members to, and that is the necessity for more officers. The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in his report sets out that it will be necessary by the time the present ships now in process of construction are completed to have at least a thousand men to successfully officer them. Now, when the committee started in on the consideration of this question, they called upon the Department to furnish an itemized list of the number of officers needed for each ship, and that list or statement you will find in the report on page 14, giving the names of the ship and

the number of officers for each ship.

The committee also, at the same time, called on the Department for a statement as to what our officers were doing at the present time, whether on sea or shore duty, and you will find the statement upon page 15 of the report to this effect. The total number of line officers to-day in the Navy is 1,017, including 124 cadets now at sea, and who have not as yet received their commissions. Of this number there are 993 eligible for sea duty. Of this number 709 are performing duty on vessels or are beyond the seas, 272 performing duty on shore. Now, it will be seen that there are comparatively few officers to officer our ships which are

now in process of building.

And if we are to have the officers ready when the ships are completed, it is necessary for us now to make provision for more Why? Because it takes four years—yes, six years—to eers. They must have an education at the Naval Academy, which requires four years, and then two years of sea service before receiving their commissions. So in this bill the committee have recommended a provision for an increase of officers to the extent of 500—a temporary provision, because it operates only for the coming four years. It is believed that when the present law, which was modified a year or so ago, by which every member of the House appoints a cadet once in four years instead of once in six years, has had time to operate, that law will provide for the officers needed for our growing Navy.

Now, as I say, this bill provides for the appointment of 500 ad-

The first year The President ditional cadets, covering a period of four years. the Senators are to make appointments, one each. The President is given the appointment of 6 cadets a year, or 24 cadets covering the four years; and then during the succeeding three years each member of the House will have an additional appointment. In that way we make up the number of 500 additional cadets

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. At what date will a member have

the right to make an appointment?

Mr. FOSS. That will be determined by the Navy Department—probably by lot.

Mr. METCALF. Can the gentleman tell us how many officers are stationed at the private shipbuilding yards of the country?

Mr. FOSS. At present?
Mr. METCALF. Yes, sir.
Mr. FOSS. No; I do not know.
Mr. LANDIS. After these cadets appointed in this manner go out, is provision made for appointments to keep up the number?

Mr. FOSS. Well, this provision, as I say, is temporary and ceases to operate at the end of four years. The present law operates continuously—during the coming four years and after that.

Mr. LANDIS. And unless some additional legislation-Mr. FOSS. Unless some additional legislation is had, that will be the only law in existence to give us more officers after the expiration of this temporary provision. But the committee believe, or rather hope, that the present law will be sufficient to produce enough officers for the increasing Navy.

Mr. LANDIS. Then, after the expiration of this temporary provision, things will drop back to the normal condition?

Mr. FOSS. Yes, sir. Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. What provision is there in the bill for the construction of new ships at Government navy-yards? Mr. FOSS. I will say to my friend that I shall reach that question in a moment or two.

Now, I have touched upon the question of more men and more Now, I have touched upon the question of more men and more officers, and have pointed out the recommendations of the committee in these respects. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wm. Alden Smith] calls my attention to the ships. We have provided in this bill for the increase of the Navy by the construction of 2 battle ships, 2 armored cruisers, and 2 gunboats. We are to-day building 8 battle ships. We have more than half of them completed. We are building 6 armored cruisers, about one-fourth of which are completed. We are building 9 protected cruisers, 5 of which are more than half completed. We have 9 towneds houts nearly completed and 7 submarines nearly finished. torpedo boats nearly completed and 7 submarines nearly finished.

I might say that the committee have recommended the building of 2 battle ships and 2 armored cruisers in the line of what might be called a suggestion from Congress last year. It will be remembered that in the last naval appropriation bill Congress enacted a provision calling upon the Secretary of the Navy to report upon the cost of 2 battle ships and 2 armored cruisers. I will not read the provision, but the Secretary of the Navy was called upon to submit a report upon the whole subject, which he has already done and which any member can refer to if he desires.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How much are they to cost?

Mr. FOSS. The cost of these ships, in accordance with plans

recommended by the Board of Construction, amounts in all to about \$30,000,000. The battle ships, which will be ships of 16,000 tons each—the largest battle ships of any that we have—will cost

tons each—the largest battle ships of any time to have seen and seen anywhere from \$6,000,000 to six and a half million dollars.

A MEMBER Inclusive of ordnance?

A Member. Inclusive of ordnance?

Mr. FOSS. Inclusive of everything; that is the completed cost.

Now, the armored cruisers will cost \$6,700,000 apiece, and the
gunboats \$510,000 apiece, making in all a total cost for 2 firstclass battle ships, 2 armored cruisers, and 2 gunboats approximately \$29,500,000.

Now, there are several boards in the Navy Department whose business it is to recommend naval programmes. One is the general board. They have recommended the building of something like 35 ships. Then there is the Board of Construction, which recommended to the Secretary of the Navy the building of about 40 And the Secretary of the Navy made a recommendation, I think, calling for 22 ships in number. I have not counted them up. He asked for 3 first-class battle ships, 2 first-class armored cruisers, 3 gunboats of 6,000 tons displacement, 3 gunboats of 2,000 tons displacement, 3 picket boats of 600 tons displacement, 3 steel training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons and 4 training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons and 4 training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons and 4 training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons and 4 training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons and 4 training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons and 4 training ships of about 2,000 tons displacement, 1 collier of 15,000 tons displacement, 2 collier of 15,000 tons displacement, 3 collier of 15,000 tons displacement, 15,000 tons, and 4 tugboats, and while the recommendations of the different boards have been had, yet it must be remembered, of course, that the men who recommend them are naval officers ambitious for the profession in which they are engaged and are desirous of seeing our Navy built up as fast and speedily as possible; but this committee—and I refer to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union-composed of the representatives of the American people, have to decide for the people themselves as to how far and how fast we shall pursue the policy of building

up the American Navy.

Now, in view of the fact that Congress intimated in the appropriation bill of last year that it was its wish that the Secretary of the Navy should report only upon two battle ships and two armored cruisers, the Committee on Naval Affairs did not think it wise to make any further recommendation, and that is the reason why we come here with a programme to-day of two battle ships and two armored cruisers and two gunboats, in all, a total tonnage of 63,000 tons, requiring an appropriation of \$30,000,000, not in this bill, but in subsequent bills, to construct them, because we believe that we are carrying out the intimation and suggestion of Congress in the appropriation bill of last year. Now, we have had greater programmes than this in years past. Under the naval appropriation bill of March 3, 1899, we provided for a total tonnage that year of ships to the amount of 104,000 tons, and under the appropriation bill passed June 7, 1900, we made the further increase in ships to the amount of 99,920 tons. The programme this year, if it pass by the committee and the House and Congress, will add only 63,000 tons to the tonnage of our Navy; and so I say to you that it is a moderate increase, it is a healthy increase, but I believe that it is none too large if we are to continue the policy

of building up the American Navy, and building it up in such strength and power as to maintain the honor of our country and to back up our foreign policy in every port and harbor throughout

the world. [Applause.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if it will not interrupt the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to ask him whether or not the building of these ships in the navy-yards of the United States is an experiment. I notice by the report, on page 19, that it states "that it is believed by your committee that nothing short of experiment of this kind will settle the question that affects many minds." Is this an experiment or has it been tried before, and if so, whether it was successful?

Mr. FOSS. It has been tried before, and I will reach the discussion of that question a little later. I want, in the first place, to call the attention of the committee to the present condition of the American Navy. In the report which I have the honor to make for the committee, after presenting a table of the number of ships that have already been built and which are now building, I made this statement, which has attracted, I may say, some little public attention:

It will be seen from the above table that while we have built and are building, all told, 138 ships, yet comparatively few of them have any real fighting value. Our naval provess lies almost entirely in our 18 battle ships, 8 armored cruisers, and 21 protected cruisers. The rest of our ships would cut but little figure in actual warfare. Ships of the battle line practically alone determine the naval strength of a nation.

I mean by that, not ships of the battle line in the technical and historical sense, because that would refer simply to battle ships, but ships of the battle line in the larger and broader sense, including armored cruisers and protected cruisers. Now, I say that while we have built 138 ships, and are building them to-day, yet we have not a navy of which we can boast. We have only 10 bat-tle ships already built and 8 under construction, and yet Secretary Tracy said in one of his reports that we have no business to consider that we had a navy until we have at least 20 battle ships. We have a good many ships upon the list of vessels which any of you can see if you will read the reports of the Navy Department, but most of these boats are peace boats, and in this connection I do not wish to have you take my statement alone, but take the statement of one of the ablest of our naval authorities, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, Admiral Charles O'Neil. In a speech which he made before the New York Yacht Club not long ago he said something about the strength of our present Navy. Said he:

It might be advisable to fool other nations if we could with regard to our naval strength, but we surely do not want to fool ourselves, and a little introspection may be beneficial even if our national pride suffers somewhat in comparison.

Now let us see exactly how we stand:

Now let us see exactly how we stand:

The Navy list of Jannary 1, 1902, contains the names of 243 completed vessels and of 60 in process of construction, a total of 303 vessels, and a very respectable showing, so far as numbers go. The question is, What are these 303 vessels and how many of them have any real military value? Of the completed vessels I find that 8 are unserviceable wooden ships of ancient date, which will probably soon be sold to the highest bidder. One is an old iron, paddle-wheel steamer, the Monocacy, which has been in Chinese waters for over thirty years and ought to have been in the scrap heap years ago. One is the Spanish cruiser Reina Mercedes, which was sunk by the Spaniards at Santiago de Cuba, was afterwards raised, and of which it is proposed to make a sailing training ship; 6 are old wooden frigates, used for receiving ships; 39 are tugboats; 1 is the so-called dynamite cruiser Vesuvius, having no military value; 1 is the ram Katahdin, a pronounced failure; 5 are purchased steamers, used as training ships for landsmen and having no military value; 8 are old-fashioned wooden sailing sloops of war, used by the Naval Militia and for State marine schools; 2 are wooden training ships for apprentices; 1 is a small sailing practice vessel for the cadets at Annapolis; 6 are old single-turretted monitors, with cast-iron, smooth-bore guns, relics of the civil war and of no value; 16 are colliers; 10 are supply vessels, tank steamers, and refrigerating ships; 48 are little gunboats, varying from 400 to 500 tons, mostly captured or bought in the Philippines, and 28 are torpedo boats, only useful for special purposes. That is to say, that 181 of the 242 completed vessels mow on the Navy list have practically no fighting qualities; in fact, absolutely none, if we may except the torpedo boats.

Of the 62 remaining vessels, 10 are second and third class cruisers like the Chicago, Baltimore, Cincinnati, and Detroit; 30 are small cruisers and gunboats like the Vorktown, Nashville, and others; and 6 ar

Then he goes on and speaks of the vessels which we are now building.

Fortunately-

He says-

we have a very respectable building programme now under way, as the ships now building will equal in fighting efficiency all the rest of the Navy. Of the 60 vessels now under construction, 8 are first-class battle ships; 3 are large armored cruisers, much more powerful than the New York; 6 are partially protected cruisers of 3,200 tons displacement; 4 are harbor-defense monitors; 16 are torpedo-boat destroyers; 10 are torpedo boats, and 7 submarine boats.

We may safely add 27 of the above vessels to our 32 of to-day, which will in about three years' time, give us 59 good fighting vessels, 18 of which will be battle ships, 8 armored cruisers, 10 monitors, and about 23 protected and

partially protected cruisers; and we shall also have about 57 torpedo vessels and a lot of small gunboats and miscellaneous auxiliary craft, useful in their proper sphere.

From the foregoing it will be seen that we are deficient in powerful fighting vessels, and it behooves us to push on with the construction of battle ships and armored cruisers until we have a respectable number of each, not wasting our energies or money on a lot more miscellaneous small craft until we have accomplished the more important construction.

And that recommendation is in line with that of this committee. And that recommendation is in line with that of this committee. We recommend two great battle ships, the largest we have ever built, ships the plans for which have already attracted the eyes of the naval authorities of the countries of the world, and in addition to that, two great armored cruisers, practically battle ships; and then we have put in a couple of small gunboats. But the policy of the committee, if I can in any measure speak for it, I think, is almost unanimously for putting the people's money into real fighting ships, ships of the battle line, and not into a whole lot of peace boats which do not amount to anything at whole lot of peace boats which do not amount to anything at

Now, I know that there are some-we hear it here and there and everywhere—who think that just because we whipped Spain in a fight of a hundred days and only lost a single life we could wipe out the fleets of the navies of the world. There is an impression which has gone out that the American Navy is strong and mighty and powerful. Yes; it is, so far as it goes. I believe we have better officers, better men, and that our ships, ship for ship, are better than those of any navy in the world. But do not let us delude ourselves with the thought that because we whimseld a little postion which had a little postion. whipped a little nation, which had only a little navy, therefore we can whip anything that comes along. Why, it would have been our everlasting shame if our two fleets at Manila and Santiago had not sunk both of the Spanish fleets. Why? Because they were superior; they had a greater tonnage, each of them. I have here a statement which I propose to insert in the RECORD, showing the relative comparison of the two fleets at the battle of Manila and the battle of Santiago, and while I would not for a single moment disparage the bravery and the courage of our American officers and men and the value of our ships, yet, if there is any lesson to be learned from the Spanish-American war, it is that superior men, superior ships—in tonnage, in armament, and in armor-superior gunnery, and superior marksmanship will win in the future as they have won in the past. [Applause.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1902.

DEAR SIE: In compliance with your request of the 29th ultimo for information relative to the size of the two fleets, Spanish and American, at the battles of Manila Bay and Santiago, I have the honor to transmit herewith a memorandum which contains the desired data.

Very respectfully,

J. H. GIBBONS,

J. H. GIBBONS, Lieutenant-Commander, U. S. Navy, Acting Chief Intelligence Officer.

Hon. George Edmund Foss, Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

ENGAGEMENT IN MANILA BAY, MAY 1, 1898.

APRIL 30, 1902.

APRIL 30, 1902.

From the following tables it will be seen that the Spanish had a numerical superiority in ships and men. The data for the Spanish force is taken from Estado General de la Armada for 1898, and, as the complements there given are on a peace footing, it is reasonable to suppose that the numbers are a low estimate.

Leaving aside shore batteries and submarine defenses, there can be no question as to the superiority of the American ships and armaments over the Spanish. As to the extent of this superiority, the following comparison of armaments of the two fleets is given:

MAIN BATTERY

Guns.	American.	Spanish.
8-inch	10	0
6-inch	23	7 6.3-inch.
5-inch	20	7 6.3-inch. 3 5.9-inch. 4 5.1-inch. 22 4.7-inch.
Total	53	36

SECONDARY BATTERY.

Guns.	American.	Spanish.
3-inch	2	{ 2.3.54-inch. 2.3.43-inch.
2.25-inch, 6-pounder	34	4 2.95-inch. 8 2.76-inch. 9 2.24-inch.
1.85-inch, 3-pounder 1.46-inch, 1-pounder Machine or mitrailleuse	10 27 9	10 1.65 inch. 24 12
Total	82.	71

THE AMERICAN FLEET.					THE AMERICAN FLEET—continued.				
Name of ship.	Date of launching.		Protection.	Armament.	Name of ship.	Date of launching.		Protection.	Armament.
Olympia	1892	Tons. 5,870	Protective deck, 4.75 to 2 inch; 2 bar- bettes, 4.5-inch; 2 turrets, 6-inch;	4 8-inch, 10 5-inch, 14 2.25-inch, 7 1.46- inch, 1 machine.	Boston	1884	Tons. 3,000	Protective deck, 1.5-inch.	2 8-inch, 6 6-inch, 2 2.25-inch, 4 1.85- inch, 4 1.46-inch, 1 machine.
Baltimore	1888	4,413	conning tower, 5- inch; sponsons, 4- inch and 2-inch. Protective deck, 4-	48-inch, 66-inch, 4	Concord	1890	1,710	None	66-inch, 22.25 inch, 21.85 inch, 31.46- inch, 2 machine.
Daitimor C	1000	2,210	inch to 2.5-inch.	2.25-inch, 2 1.85- inch, 6 1.46-inch, 1 3-inch, 2 ma-	Petrel	1888	892	do	4 6-inch, 2 1.85 inch, 3 1.46 inch, 2 ma- chine.
Raleigh	1892	3,213	Protective deck, 2.5- inch to 1-inch.	chine. 1 6-inch, 10 5-inch, 8 2.25-inch, 4 1.46-	McCulloch	1896	1,280	do	4 2.25-inch.
				inch, 1 3-inch, 1 machine.	Total complem	ent, 1,88	6 officer	s and men.	

THE SPANISH FLEET.

Name of ship.	Date of launch.	Material of hull.	Displace- ment.	Protection.	Comple- ment.	Armament.*
Reina Christina	1886	Iron	Tons. 3,520	None	352	6 6.3-inch H.; 3 2.24-inch N.; 2 1.65-inch N.; 2 2.75-inch N.; 6 1.46-inch R. C.; 2 43-inch M.
Castilla	1881	Wood	3,260	do	349	4 5.12-inch K.; 2 4.72-inch K.; 2 3.43-inch K.; 4 2.95-inch K.; 4 1.65-inch N.; 4 1.46-inch R. C.
Don Juan de Austria.	1887	Iron	1,159	do	179	4 4.72-inch H.; 2 2.76-inch H.; 2 1.65-inch N.; 4 1.46-inch R. C.; 1 .43-inch M.
Don Antonio de Ul- loa.	1887	do	1,160	do		44.72-inch H.; 22.76-inch H.; 22.24-inch R. F.; 41.46-inch R. C.; 1.43-inch M.
Isla de Cuba	1886	Steel	1,045	Protective deck, 2.44 inches.	156	4 4.72-inch H.; 2 2.24-inch R. F.; 2 1.46-inch R. C.; 1 .43-inch M.; 1 1.46-inch R. F.
Isla de Luzon	1886	do	1,045	do		Do.
Marques del Duero General Lezo	1875 1883	Iron	500 520	Nonedo		1 6.3-inch P.; 2 4.72-inch B. R.; 1 .43-inch N. 2 4.72-inch H.; 1 3.54-inch H.; 2 .98-inch N.; 1 .43-inch M.
Velasco		do	1,152	do		35.91-inch A.; 22.76-inch H.; 2.98-inch N.
Argos	1880		508	do	87	1 3.54-inch H.
Manila	1883	Iron	1,900	do	77	2 1.65-inch B. R.
Isla de Mindanao b					120	
Total					1,993	

a.H. = Hontoria, N. = Nordenfeldt, R. C. = Hotchkiss revolving cannon, M. = Mitrailleuse, K. = Krupp, P. = Pallisser, A. = Armstrong, B. R. = Bronze rifled.
b.Armed transport; took part in battle; armament and complement not known—later estimated at 120.

Engagement at Santiago de Cuba, July 3, 1898. SPANISH FLEET.

Name of ship.	Date of launch.	Trial speed.	Ton- nage.	Protection.	Crew.	Armament.
Infanta Maria Teresa	1890	Knots. 20.2	e 200	1 1-3t 10 to 10 20 to 10 10 to 10	556	9 11 inch 10 5 5 inch 9 6 manual 0 75 16
Inianu maria Teresa	1990	20.2	6,890	Armor belt, 12 to 10 and 9 inch; protective deck, 3 to 2 inch.	550	2 11-inch, 10 5.5-inch, 8 6-pounder Q. F., 10 1-pounder Q. F., 10 machine.
Viscaya Almirante Oquendo	1891	20.2	6,890	do	491	Do.
Almirante Oquendo	1891	20.2	6,890	do	487	Do.
Cristobal Colon	1896	19.8	6,840	Armor belt, 6 to 2 inch; protective deck, 12 inch.	567	10 6-inch, 6 4.7-inch Q. F., 10 6-pounder, Q. F., 10 1-pounder Q. F., 2 machine.
Pluton	1897	30	400	None	80	2 14-pounder Q. F., 2 6-pounders Q. F., 2 1-pounder Q. F.
Furor	1896	28	370	do	80	Do.
			N.S.	AMERICAN FLEET.		
Indiana	1893	15.5	10, 230	Armor belt, 18 to 10 inch; protective deck, 8-inch.	571	4 13-inch, 8 8-inch, 4 6-inch, 206-pounders, 7 1-pounders, 2 machine.
Oregon	1893	16.7	10,230	do	524	Do.
OregonIowa	1896	17.1	11,296	Armor belt, 14 to 10 inch; protective deck, 3-inch.	587	4 12 inch, 8 8-inch, 6 4-inch, Q. F., 20 6-pounders, 2 1-pounders, 4 machine.
Texas	1892	17.8	6,300	Armor belt, 12 to 9 inch; protective deck, 3-inch.	433	2 12-inch, 6 6-inch, 126-pounders, 10 1-pounders, 2 machine.
Brooklyn	1895	22	9,153	Armor belt, 41-inch; protective deck, 3 to 6 inch.	552	8 8-inch, 12 5-inch Q. F., 12 6-pounders, 4 1- pounders, 4 machine.
Gloucester	1891	18 12	800 165	Nonedo	93	4 6-pounders, 4 3-pounders, 2 machine, 4 6-pounders, 4 3-pounders.
Vixen New York	1891	21	8,480	Armor belt, 3.8-inch; protective deck, 2.5	652	6 8-inch, 12 4-inch Q. F., 8 C-pounders, 2 1- pounders, 2 machine.
Ericsson	1892	23	120	None	21	41-pounders.

So the lesson that comes to us, as the result of our recent war with Spain, is not to stop building, but to build onward and up-

with spain, is not to stop building, but to build onward and upward the American Navy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to another question. We have provided in this bill for a naval programme which I say, in my judgment and the judgment of the committee, is a healthy one, a conservative one, on the lines of our past policy, and a naval programme which I think will meet with approval everywhere throughout the country. But it is necessary in this bill to provide also how these ships shall be constructed. Heretofore it has been the policy of our country, with but few exceptions, to construct our ships in private yards, because I think it has been the consensus of public opinion that they could be constructed more cheaply there than in our Government navy-yards.

there than in our Government navy-yards.

Many of you have received a great deal of literature upon this question of the construction of ships in Government navy-yards.

I have some of it here. You may recognize it, perhaps, as I hold it up for you to look at. These cards have been sent to members of Congress, calling their attention from time to time to the wisdom of constructing ships in Government navy-yards. Now, I desire to say a few words upon this question. In the first place, I desire to call your attention to the fact that all of these cards come from the Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo, Cal. It was my pleasure to visit that little city last summer, and I was very pleasantly entertained there. They are very much interested in building ships in Government navy-yards there. Why? I will say, in the first place, that this is a city of about 7,000 population. It has comparatively few industries of its own.

Most of the people or laboring men there depend absolutely for

Most of the people or laboring men there depend absolutely for employment upon the navy-yard across the river. They are naturally in favor of building ships in Government navy-yards. They are naturally anxious to call attention of members of

Congress to this. They would not only like to build one ship there, but they would like to build the whole American Navy there. Why? Because, as I say, they are absolutely dependent upon Government work in order to feed, clothe, and to keep themselves and their families alive. That is an honest, legitimate ambition. I have nothing to say against it, but I have something to say against the fallacious statements and misrepresentations of fact which have been sent out upon these cards to members of Congress. If they contained the truth I would not say anything. But when they try to influence your vote and mine with misstate-ments of fact I think it is only proper that somebody should call attention to the matter.

Mr. METCALF. Do I understand the gentleman to say the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce has made misstatements as to the condition of the Navy?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; some misstatements.
Mr. METCALF. I wish you would point out where any misstatements have been made.

Mr. FOSS. Now, here is a card which has been sent out by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce:

From the Paymaster-General of the Navy's report for 1899, page 36, we find the value of navy-yard plants which are used for the repairing of vessels to be \$42,395,136. There has since then been appropriated \$51,893,297, making the enormous sum of \$94,288,433. The Bureau of Yards and Docks has recommended to this Congress that \$18,786,075 additional be appropriated, making in all \$113,074,508.

As the Bureau of Yards and Docks have all the quay walls, dry docks, sidewalks, buildings, and other improvements built by contract (see Secretary of the Navy's report for 1901, pages 219 to 245), it is the incentive for the contractors to help the Bureau build up the plants.

Value of plants, January 1, 1902.

Portsmouth, N. H Boston Brooklyn Philadelphia Norfolk Port Royal Pensacola Mare Island Bremerton Algiers	17, 849, 761 29, 021, 068 9, 344, 963 9, 810, 610 3, 427, 910 2, 565, 475 11, 178, 752
Additional appropriations asked for	94 988 433
Total valuation to date	113,074,508

This vast sum represents more money than is invested in all the ship-building plants of this country engaged in the building of Government ships. Those in authority claim the navy-yards can not build battle ships because of the lack of the proper facilities, notwithstanding the expenditure of this enormous sum for such purposes.

From the Paymaster-General of the Navy's report for 1901 we find under the heading:

STATEMENT D.

Portsmouth, N. H.....

Statement showing expenditures for maintenance and improven the several naval stations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901:

Boston	1,252,408
Brooklyn	
Philadelphia.	
Norfolk	
Port Royal	305, 206
Pensacola	296, 377
Mare Island	1,478,104
Bremerton	
Algiers	285, 402
Total under titles G, E, and F	10,854,546
TITLE D.	
Repairs to vessels, report 1900, labor and material, Title D	\$3,312,961
Repairs to vessels, report 1901, labor and material, Title D	5,001,571
Total repairs for two years	8,314,532
A war a war wan at all the news wands	4 157 000

Repairs to vessels, report 1901, labor and material, Title D	5,001,571
Total repairs for two years	8,314,532 4,157,266
SUMMARY.	
Value of plants used for repairing vessels	113,074,510
Interest at 3 per cent per annum	3, 392, 235 10, 854, 546

Repairs to vessels per year, Title D	4, 157, 266
Amount expended per year	18,404,047
There is no record of any new construction work having been d	

Total cost of maintenance per year 14,246,781

There is no record of any new construction work having been done. This is a startling summary to place before the country; a plant costing \$113,074.510, in operation, expending \$18,404.047 annually, to produce \$4,157,266 in results.

The navy-yards at the present time are used for no other purpose but that of repairing vessels; they should also be engaged in building the new Navy, instead of being comparatively idle as they now are. Every private yard in this country is congested with work; every Government contract ship under construction is from twenty months to three years behind contract time. The lobby of the combine pleaded with the last Congress to appropriate no more money for the increase of the Navy for that session because they could not build what they already had under construction. If there were \$20,000,000 worth of new construction work at the navy-yards, the cost for maintenance would not be greater than it now is.

If the Government can not build battle ships in the plants represented by this immense investment, don't you think that it is time to close the navy-yards or get some one else to run them?

And here is a comment, not of mine, but the comment of Admiral Bowles, Chief Constructor of the American Navy, the head of the Bureau:

This card-

Says Admiral Bowles-

alleging that the Government has a plant in operation costing \$113,000,000, spending \$18,000,000 annually to produce \$4,000,000 in results, is a perversion of the figures. The Paymaster General's report (page 814 of the Secretary's report of 1899) gives the appraised value of the navy-yards and naval stations at that date as \$42,395,136, about 90 per cent of which is real estate and over \$20,000,000 of which is the value of the real estate of the Brooklyn Navy-Yard. In order to make up the difference between this and \$113,000,000 the makers of this card have added all the appropriations for improvements to the navy-yards made since 1899—

And in this connection I will say upon my own authority, they have added the estimates for this year to the amount of \$18,786,000, which we have reduced to \$6,500,000 in order to make up this \$113,000,000.

The makers of this card-

Says Admiral Bowles—

have added all the appropriations for improvements to the navy-yards made since 1899, a great portion of which is not yet expended, and even if it were, can not be added to the previous appraisal to obtain the present value.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?
Mr. FOSS. Wait until I get through with this. And not only
that, but these cards have gone upon the theory and supposition
that the chief and only business of a navy-yard is to repair ships.
Well, now, that is not the fact. Admiral Bowles says a very large proportion-considerably more than one-half-of the value of the navy-yards has no relation to their value as industrial establishments for doing work in the construction and repair of vessels, and relates to the functions of the navy-yards as arsenals vessels, and relates to the functions of the navy-yards as arsenals and depots for the maintenance of public property in the way of guns, ammunition, food, and stores of all kinds, which have to do with the maintaining and keeping of the naval supplies, and is entirely apart from the industrial and mechanical business of construction and repair. This will be clear to you when I explain that at the date of appraisal, in 1899, the total value of the machinery plant of the navy-yards doing repair work amounted to less than 10 per cent of their total value.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

tion?

Mr. FOSS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman kindly state the date of that card?

Mr. FOSS. I can not say; there is no date on the inside. Mr. FITZGERALD. Some time this year?

Mr. FOSS. It is a card I received during the last few months. Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that Admiral Bowles refers to an appraisal made in 1899. I call the attention to the appraisal given in his own report, showing the value June 30, 1901, that the total value of all the yards, machinery, and equipment aggregates \$78,900,000; and eliminating the foreign-if we can call them foreign-naval stations, the chairman's own reports bring the value of these plants to over \$70,000,000.

Mr. METCALF. Nearly \$80,000,000. Mr. FITZGERALD. It brings it up to \$30,000,000 more than what the gentleman says Admiral Bowles puts it at.

Mr. FOSS. That takes in the foreign stations.
Mr. METCALF. It takes them all in.
Mr. FOSS. In the card you will find that this is the basis for their statement that has been sent out; i. e., they quote from exactly the same report, from the Paymaster-General of the Navy report in 1899, page 34, where we find the value of the navy-yard plants used for repairing vessels put at \$42,395,000. Admiral Bowles has taken their card and shown from their own card that they have perverted facts.

Mr. RIXEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?
Mr. FOSS. I prefer to go along now.
Mr. RIXEY. I simply wanted to know if the statement of
Admiral Bowles was a public document?

Admiral Bowles was a public document?

Mr. FOSS. It will be in to-morrow's Record; it has not been published yet. Now, as to another statement—

Mr. METCALF. Will the gentleman pardon me? In fairness, having criticised the statement sent out by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce, I ask that he publish this card for the purpose of showing whether or not any misstatement has been made. I think it is that that the bould go into the Precord. it is but fair that that should go into the RECORD.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, here is another card which has been sent out by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce, and upon

it you will see the picture of two ships, one the Monterey and the other the Monadnock. The Monterey was built at the Union Iron Works, and the Monadnock was built at Mare Island Navy-Yard.

Now, they made the statement on this card that the difference in cost to date as between these two vessels which they say are very nearly alike, but upon which there is justly a great difference of opinion, that the difference in cost to date is \$530,000 in favor of the ship built at the Mare Island Navy-Yard. Now, I want to read you what Admiral Bowles, the chief constructor in the Navy says about that the Navy, says about that:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 21, 1902.

Washington, D. C., April 21, 1902.

In regard to the comparative statements of the cost of the Monadnock, built by the Government, and the Monterey, built by contract, the principal error made in the statements on these cards consists in the entire omission of the amounts expended by the Government on the Monadnock in the construction of the hull and machinery up to the time that the vessel was turned over to the Mare Island Navy-Yard for completion, under the authority granted by the act of March 3, 1883, so that the statements of cost given by the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce include only the amounts expended subsequent to that date. An accurate statement of the comparative cost of the hull and machinery of the Monadnock and Monterey is given below, and instead of showing that the Monadnock was built at the navy-yard for \$30,981 less than the Union Iron Works built the Monaterey, on the contrary the Monadnock cost \$337,199.16 more than the Monterey for corresponding items.

Under the circumstances, it is not necessary to cumber this account with any description of the differences existing between the vessels which make the Monterey a much more valuable and expensive ship if contemporaneously built.

Cost of Monadnock.

Hull prior to act of 1883 Hull since act of 1883 Steam engineering prior to act of 1883 Steam engineering since act of 1883 Ordnance since act of 1883 Equipment since act of 1883	941,800.77 98,110.01 501,331.81 79,852.29
Total	2, 209, 979, 27

Corresponding cost of Monterey.	
Hull and machinery, paid contractors Extras to contractors: Construction and repair Steam engineering Trial-trip expenses	121, 836, 60 32, 823, 00
Total paid contractors	1,799,192.08
Work done by Government: Construction and repair Steam engineering Ordnance Equipment	4,549.43 1,386.16
Total	1 872 780 11

F. T. BOWLES Chief Constructor United State

Mr. METCALF. That statement made in that card was taken from Senate Document 175, furnished by the Secretary of the Navy, and they have subsequently corrected it in another card giving the absolute cost of the ship to the Government. The gentleman from Illinois must have received that subsequent card and statement.

Mr. FOSS. No; I have not received it.
Mr. METCALF. I have received it, and I will explain it at

Mr. METCALF. I have received it, and I will explain it at the proper time.

Mr. FOSS. Now, there is another matter—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Before the gentleman passes from that point, will he say whether it is stated there that the cost of undoing work which had been done was estimated by one of the naval constructors as greater than the cost of doing the work from the beginning?

Mr. FOSS. I did not catch the gentleman's question.
Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the gentleman whether it does not
appear from that card that a naval constructor has given it as his opinion that tearing out the work which had been done by contract amounted practically to as much, if not more, than the building of the entire ship anew.

Mr. FOSS. I do not find that statement here.
Mr. FITZGERALD. If that statement is made, I think the House should know it.

Mr. FOSS. Here is the card. If the gentleman can find it there, well and good.

Now, here is another card which has been sent out, showing

the cost of different vessels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. I ask unanimous consent that I may finish my remarks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that the gentleman be allowed to proceed until he has concluded his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. That consent is unnecessary, as the gentle-

man controls the time himself.
Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will go on

and tell us all he can about this bill.

Mr. FOSS. Here is another card showing the cost of the different vessels. Admiral Bowles has taken one of these cards which has been sent to members of Congress and furnishes this statement thereon. Here is the card:

	Gross tonnage.	Cost of hull and machinery.	Built by—	Cost per ton, hull and machinery.	Cost of finished vessel.	Displacement.	Cost per ton of finished vessel.
1890. Oregon	Tons. 5,591 5,289 5,289	\$3,222,810 3,063,000 3,063,000	Union Cramp	\$576 579 576	\$8,575,000 6,047,117 5,933,371	Tons. 10,288 10,288 10,288	\$639 587 581
1892. Iowa	6,294	3,010,000	do	478	5,871,206	11,340	562
1895. Kearsarge Kentucky	6,831 7,087	2,250,000 2,250,000	Newportdo	329 317	5,593,977 5,482,455	11,540 11,540	485 475
1896. Illinois	6,802 6,802 6,802	2,595,000 2,650,000 2,674,950	do Cramp Union	381 389 393	5,844,184 6,028,313 6,035,291	11,565 11,565 11,653	505 511 510
1898. Maine Missouri Ohio	7,139 7,179 7,384	2,885,000 2,885,000 2,899,000	Cramp Newport Union	404 402 392	5,674,141 5,677,550 5,612,837	12,300 12,230 12,440	461 464 451
1901. Virginia Pennsylvania			Newport			15,014 14,014	404 373

We find from the accompanying table that the prices of finished ships have fallen from \$639 per ton in 1890, when the Union and the Cramps had no opposition, to \$451 in 1898, when they had the competition of the Newport News, and to \$404 per ton in 1901, when they had the competition of the Bath Iron Works, Fore River Ship Company, the Morans, and the Newport News.

Or, had they built the Ohio in 1890 instead of in 1898, and had charged for her the same price that they charged for building the Oregon, viz. \$639 per ton, she would have cost \$7,939,160 instead of \$5,612,837, a difference of \$2,327,323.

ton, she would have cost \$1,939,160 instead of \$5,612,837, a difference of \$2,327,323.

We take the hull and machinery as a basis to figure the profit to the contractor, as the price of armor does not figure in the building. It is said that the Newport News built the hull and machinery of the Kentucky for about cost, which is \$317 per ton. Granting this to be true, we find that the Union Iron Works charged \$576 per ton for the Oregon, a profit of \$1,428,079. Adding speed premium, \$175,000, will make a total profit of \$1,503,079 on the hull and machinery.

Profit on the Massachusetts, adding speed premium, \$100,000, makes a net profit of \$1,569,851. Profit on the Indiana, speed premium of \$38,500, makes a net profit of \$1,322,304. There were, in addition to these figures, from \$150,000 to \$250,000 paid as extras on the hull and machinery, principally for changes, the profit on which was not less than two-thirds. This should be added to their net profits as stated above.

Profit on the lova, \$984,652. Add speed premium of \$217,420 makes a net profit of \$1,202,072.

From 1890 to 1901 the prices paid for material and wages has been steadily increasing, while the prices charged by the contractors for finished ships has been steadily decreasing.

From the above you can see what competition has done for the Government.

Do you wonder that the contractors oppose the building of battle ships in the navy-yards? We do not, for we know the profits they have made in

They do not want the competition of the navy-yards.

Why not divide the profits with the horny-handed sons of toil instead of giving it all to the favored few? The latter are now rich enough.

Here is the statement of Admiral Bowles:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1902.

This card gives the cost of each of the battle ships, per gross ton, which is an unsuitable method of comparison, as the gross tonnage merely represents the cubical capacity of the hull, and therefore is not a measure of the contract work.

tract work.

I inclose a table of cost of battle ships, based upon the contract weight, exclusive of armor and armament—that is, the cost per ton is the cost per ton of weight contracted for in the hull, machinery, and fittings. Down to the Wisconsin in this table the figures are the actual returned cost—that is, including the contract price and extras. From the Maine to the Pennsylvania it is the contract price alone, and the amounts will probably show, when completed, from \$20 to \$30 more per ton. It is true that the Kearsarge and Kentucky were built at probably less than cost, and the price, \$85 per ton, certainly involves no profit. The first battle ships, Oregon, Massachusetts, and Indiana, must have brought a considerable profit to the builders, but since their time the profits have not been unreasonable, and this table clearly shows the advantages of competition.

F. T. BOWLES, Chief Constructor United States Navy.

Cost of battle ships.

	Contract weight.	Cost of hull and machin- ery, trial, and extras.	Cost per ton.	Con- tract year.
Oregon Massachusetts Indiana Iowa Kearsarge Kentucky Illinois	5,691.10 6,492.90 6,339.21 6,339.21	\$3,736,180,67 3,359,570,33 3,261,657,22 3,235,614,71 2,441,616,49 2,442,232,62 2,631,023,33	*\$656 *586 *573 *498 *385 *385	1890 1890 1890 1893 1896 1896
Alabama Wisconsin Maine Missouri Ohio Virginia Pennsylvania	6,391.72 6,391.72 7,184.91 7,184.91 7,184.91 8,874.00	2,755,206,59 2,787,696,65 2,885,000,00 2,885,000,00 2,899,000,00 3,590,000,00 3,890,000,00	*431 *436 *401 *401 *403 *405 *406	1896 1896 1898 1898 1898 1901 1901

*Actual returned cost.

b Contract price.

Now, here are some more cards which have been sent out. Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. As to some of these ships, was not a part of the hull built in Europe and brought over here?

Mr. FOSS. The gentleman may refer to two ships which were bought during the Spanish war—the Albany and the New Orleans,

which were built at Sir William Thomson's works, I think.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My information—given, I believe,
on some of these cards—is that the machinery or some part of some of these vessels was bought in some foreign country. it the Texas

Mr. FOSS. The plans of the Texas were designed by an Englishman in the employ of Sir William Thomson. I may say that I met the gentleman two years ago. Those were plans purchased by Secretary Whitney, who, I think, paid in the neighborhood of \$25,000 for them. But since then our own American designers have planned all our ships.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman will pardon me for interrupting, but I would like to know whether the plans which we bought abroad and which were used on the Texas were satis-

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My information is that they

Mr. FOSS. I think perhaps that was almost entirely the cause, although it may have been somewhat from other causes.

Mr. MAYNARD. Is it not a fact that plans which had been rejected by the English Government were purchased by the United States?

Mr. FOSS. I do not know whether that was the fact.

Mr. MAYNARD. Is it not generally conceded to have been the fact?

Mr. FOSS. I have heard a good deal to that effect.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. One of these cards states that as a fact.

A MEMBER. There is no denial of it.

Mr. LESSLER. Who did the gentleman say bought those plans?

Mr. FOSS. Secretary Whitney.

There are a number of things stated on these cards which are not absolutely true. I do not wish to state that the gentleman who sent out these cards and who was responsible for these so-called facts is willfully and maliciously trying to hoodwink the American Congress. I only desire to say that the real facts are not accurately stated, and I think this House ought to know it.

Now, here is an interesting card which has been sent out: "Some nuts for the combine to crack." Now, I do not stand here representing any combine; I do not stand here representing the shipbuilders of this country. I have no affiliations with them whatever. I simply stand here to call the attention of members of this House to the actual facts. I do not care whether the ships are built in the navy-yards or whether they are built under private contract, but as a representative of the American people, realizing that it costs millions and millions of dollars to build up a navy, six and seven millions to build a battle ship, six and seven millions to build an armored cruiser, and after you have completed each, \$1,000 a day to maintain it; realizing that the American Navy is a great, yes, a great, luxury, you may say, in times of peace, but an absolute and mighty necessity in times of war; realizing that we must have a navy and that it costs many millions to build it, as a representative of the American people I propose to see to it that the money that we put into the building of ships and into the maintenance of our men and officers and into the maintenance of our naval yards on the shore shall go

the very farthest that a dollar will for the public interest and

for the public welfare. [Applause.]

If it costs less to build ships in the navy-yards, I am for building ships in the navy-yards; if it costs less to build them under private contract, I am for that. But I am above all for the construction of our ships just where it will cost the least money and take a less number of dollars out of the pockets of the American people. Now, what about this card, "Some nuts to crack?" Let us crack a few. This is what the card says:

us crack a few. This is what the card says:

When the present stone dock at Mare Island Navy-Yard was completed the Government gave the contract to construct the caisson to the Union Iron Works for \$78,000.

A few years later they needed a new caisson, and the job of building it was given to the Mare Island mechanics, who built it for \$37,000. It is heavier and of better workmanship than the one constructed for the Government by the Union Iron Works. The Government saved on this job \$41,000, or over 100 per cent. This gives you an idea of what contractor's profits are.

Last year the Bureau of Yards and Docks wanted a barge built. They advertised for bids, and the Union Iron Works bid \$14,500, the Risdon Iron Works bid \$30,000, the mechanics at the Mare Island Navy-Yard bid to do the work for \$12,500. As the amount allotted for the job was but \$10,000 the plans were modified and the navy-yard, on account of the showing on the other bidding, was given the job. The barge was built for less than the amount estimated.

Here is a letter from Admiral Bowles, in which he says that Admiral Endicott has furnished him with accompanying memo-randa relative to the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce card, and concerning the first three paragraphs in regard to a caisson and a barge built at the Mare Island Navy-Yard:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1902.

DEAR MR. Foss; Admiral Endicott has furnished me with the accompanying memoranda relating to a Vallejo Chamber of Commerce card, and concerning the first three paragraphs in regard to a caisson and a barge built at the Mare Island Navy-Yard.

In regard to the statements of cost for putting the armor on the Monadnock, I can only say that the usual price is from \$15 to \$20 a ton, so that I can not account for the statements herein made.

Very sincerely,

F. T. BOWLES.

Hon. GEO. EDMUND Foss.

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives. Now, to read the memoranda:

MEMORANDA RELATIVE TO CRANE SCOW, NAVY-YARD, MARE ISLAND, CAL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,

Washington, D. C., April 25, 1902.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,

Washington, D. C., April 25, 1902.

The construction of a crane scow for the navy-yard, Mare Island, California, was authorized by the act of June 7, 1900, and \$12,000 appropriated therefor.

Under date of December 4, 1900, Civil Engineer Hollyday submitted a design for a barge, stating that the design was gotten up by the naval constructor at his request; that after it was prepared it was found that it could not be built within the appropriation; that he also secured estimates from the Union Iron Works and the Risdon Iron Works of San Francisco, both estimates being higher than the estimate of the naval constructor. The Bureau was never informed of the amount of any of the estimates. At the same time the civil engineer requested authority to construct a barge similar in design to the one shown, to cost not more than \$10,000, leaving \$2,000 for the installation of machinery and derrick.

Under date of December 20, 1900, the Bureau authorzed the preparation of plans for a \$10,000 pontoon.

Under date of December 27, 1900, the civil engineer submitted drawings for a steel pontoon for a 40-ton derrick, stating that the naval constructor estimated the cost of the same to be \$10,000 manufactured in the yard.

Under date of January 15, 1901, the Bureau approved the plans and authorized the work to be done by the yard force, the entire work, including the installation of the derrick, to come within the appropriation of \$12,000.

Under date of February 19, 1902, the Bureau was informed that the scow was launched at 2.30 p. m., February 11, 1902.

The report of material and labor applied for the month of February shows that the following expenditures had been made to March 1, 1902, viz:

Materials.

\$3,978.06

Materials. \$3,978.06 Labor 5,168.74

The Bureau never advertised for bids for doing this work, and never authorized the navy-yard authorities to secure estimates from any contractors. It will be seen that the scow, as originally built, was upon a plan revised from that originally contemplated, and upon which estimates were made.

Mr. METCALF. All this shows is that the work was done for

less than the amount appropriated.

Mr. FOSS. Now, about the caisson:

MEMORANDUM IN REGARD TO COST OF CAISSON FOR THE MARE ISLAND DRY DOCK.

DEY DOCK.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Washington, D. C., April 25, 1902.

The first was built in 1884 at a cost of \$56,000. It was constructed of iron at a time when prices were very high, plates costing from 0.0235 to 0.0240 of a cent per pound, angles about 0.0240 of a cent per pound, tees 0.0275 to 0.08 of a cent, beams and channels 0.0850 of a cent.

The caisson now in use was constructed in 1897, fourteen years after thirst, and of steel, when prices were much lower than in 1893, shapes of different kinds varying from about 0.02 to 0.029 of a cent per pound. This caisson cost \$42,763.64.

The difference in cost between these two caissons is, therefore, \$13,236.36.

This is accounted for to a great degree by the decreased cost of materials and in a measure by the fact that the first caisson was built upon a new and comparatively novel design, and, according to recollection, there was not much competition upon the letting of the first.

So that you will see from the reading of these cards that here are misstatements of facts, and we have here the testimony of the chief of a great Bureau in the Navy Department as against the testimony of a man who does not put his name to the cards.

Mr. METCALF. It is not the testimony of the chief of the

Bureau, but he takes the statement of the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. FOSS. Practically the same thing.
Mr. METCALF. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FOSS Yes.

Mr. METCALF. You received some 40 or 50 of these cards?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; a good many of them.
Mr. METCALF. And the only ones you desire to criticise are those to which you call the attention of the committee?
Mr. FOSS. The only ones I desire to criticise are those I call

Mr. METCALF. Nearly all these cards you have submitted to the chief constructor of the Navy?

Mr. FOSS. No, sir. Mr. METCALF. He has reported on nearly all of them.

Mr. FOSS. No; only a few of them, upon which I consider they based their argument in favor of building ships in the navyyards, and I submitted them to the chief constructor.

Mr. METCALF. Has not he stated in the main that the facts

stated in the cards are correct, that they correctly state the facts?

Mr. FOSS. In the main?

Mr. METCALF. Yes. Mr. FOSS. There are very few facts given in any of these

cards anyway, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. METCALF. You received a card, did you not, setting forth the time in which vessels were constructed in private yards, that there was not a single ship constructed under private contract that was finished in the time?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I received a card of that character.
Mr. METCALF. Was that card submitted to Admiral Bowles? Mr. FOSS. Yes: I think that card was submitted to Admiral

Mr. METCALF. Have you his answer to it? If you have, I should like to have you read it.

Mr. FOSS: That was upon the question of the time. Now, I am talking about the question of comparative cost of building in Government navy-yards and under private contract, an entirely different question.

Here is another card and Admiral Bowles's comment upon it:

SHIPBUILDING IN GOVERNMENT NAVY-YARDS.

Conceding that labor is 40 per cent higher, the Government will build cheaper than will the contractors. Look over these figures:

Senate Document No. 175, Fifty-seventh Congress, page 9, shows that the Navy Department has paid under contract for hull and machinery the sum of \$45,621,720. They have paid to the contractors for changes \$2,628,132, or 5.76 per cent.

One example: The contract for the building of the Virginia, 7,500 tons, was given to the Newport News Company for \$3,590,000, which is at the rate of \$478 per ton.

The Newport News Company built the Kentucky and the Kearsarge, 6,831 and 7,087 tons, for \$317 per ton.

Figure that the profit of the Virginia, Nebraska, Georgia, New Jersey, and the Rhode Island, all sister ships, will be not less than \$100 per ton. It will probably be more than that, but take that amount to estimate with.

Contract cost of these ships, 7,500 tons, at \$478.

Contract cost of these ships, 7,500 tons, at \$478 \$3,500,000

Profit at basis of \$100 per ton. \$3,500,000

Cost of ship to the contractor 2,840,000
On ships of this class estimate that one half the contractor's cost is for material and the other half is for labor.
Contractor's cost for labor 81,420,000
Contractor's cost for material 1,420,000

Same ship if built in the navy-yards, granting that it does cost 40 per cent more for labor, the material does not cost any more, for the Government buys it as cheap as the contractor.

Contractor's cost for labor. \$1,420,000 Add 40 per cent more, which, it is claimed, the Government has to pay for its labor in the navy-yards. 568,000

Cost of same ship, contract price for hull and machinery 3,590,000

Cost for changes, at 5.76 per cent
Inspection charges, estimated 205,784

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1903.

I have made a comparative statement of the cost of the Virginia built in a
navy-yard and built by contract, upon the same method as shown on this, the

above card, but making the profit correspond to the actual difference in cost per ton of the Virginia and Kearsarge. I have also added 10 per cent to the material cost to the Government, and 70 per cent to the contract cost of labor, instead of 40 per cent as given on the card. The 40 per cent has been taken from the statements in my testimony before the Naval Committee, that the wages at navy-yards were from 30 to 40 per cent higher than the wages at private yards. This remark applied to the day's wage, and not to the cost of labor per hour, which is quite a different matter, as is explained on page 4 of this memorandum, showing that the cost of labor per hour in a navy-yard, owing to the difference of hours of labor and paid holiday, is 70 per cent more than it is in a private yard. On page 3 of this memorandum I have made a typical comparison in the way I think it should be made, in which I have allowed the cost of labor in a navy-yard to be double the contractor's labor, which I think would be nearer the truth than 70 per cent, and this brings the excess cost of the navy-yard ship, over the contract cost to be 25.8 per cent, and it is my opinion that this is a moderate estimate under present conditions.

F. T. BOWLES, Chief Constructor United States Navy,

Cost of the Virginia, built in a navy-yard,

The actual cost of the hull and machinery of the Keursarge as completed was \$2,441,616.49, and the actual weight of items contracted for, 6,339 tons, so that the cost per ton was \$385.

The cost per ton contract weight of the Virginia is \$404.55, amounting to \$3,590,000 Extras, at 5.76 per cent \$206,784

Total. 3,796,784

Final cost per ton 429

Assuming the difference in cost per ton to be profit, or \$44 per ton instead of \$100, as stated on this card:

Cost of Vivotwie

 Cost of Virginia
 \$3,796,784

 Contractor's profit
 390,456

Assume one-half cost to be labor and one-half material, it is my opinion that the material will cost 10 per cent more if purchased by the Government, and that under existing conditions of wages paid, hours of labor, absence of piecework, holidays, and leaves of absence with pay, I am of the opinion that the labor charges in the yards would be at least 70 per cent more.

Contractor's cost of labor plus 70 per cent. \$2,885,385 Contractor's cost of material plus 10 per cent 1,773,480 Cost of Virginia built in navy-yard 4,668,865 Cost of Virginia built by contract. Contract price. \$ Extras, at 5.76 per cent. Inspection. \$3,590,000

3, 816, 784 Difference in favor of the contractor (equals 22 per cent of the contract cost)

Typical comparison of cost of ship built by contract and in Government navy-yards.

CONTRACT COST. Labor, two-thirds of net cost \$1,600,000
Material, one-third of net cost \$800,000

Total cost to contractor 3,380,000 Profit, at 10 per cent
Cost of Government inspection 35,000

COST IN NAVY-YARD.

Net cost 4,080,000
General expense, 15 per cent 612,000

Excess (equals 25.8 per cent of contract cost) Cost of labor per hour at a private yard.

Cost of labor per hour at a private yard.

[Average wage, \$2 per day.]

306 days, at 10 hours, at say \$2 per day, 3,060 hours

Price per hour

Cost of labor per hour at a navy-yard.

[Average wage, \$2.52 per day.]

365-52=313-(15+7) 22=291 days, 8 hours' work

318 days' pay, at \$2.52

Price per hour

cents
33.88

Ratio (33.88+20)

Mr. WHEELER. There lictored with a good deal of the

Mr. WHEELER. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the arguments of the chairman of the committee, and I must confess to some degree of astonishment, in view of the fact that he is the author of this report, and I think he owes it to the committee to state whether or not he is now arguing against the construction of ships in Government navy-yards, and if so, whether he proposes to oppose that provision of the bill providing for the construction of at least a part of the ships in Government navy-

Mr. FOSS. I will answer my friend from Kentucky. I am here advocating the naval appropriation bill as it was reported to the House from the Naval Committee. I am in favor of every

proposition in this bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Then—

Mr. FOSS. Now, hold on just a moment. I believe that that

provision is wise which leaves it within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy to build ships in the navy-yards, and makes it mandatory upon him to build one ship in a navy-yard. I stand for every provision in that bill; but I think it is my duty to call the attention of the members of the House to a whole bundle of misstatements which have been sent here which they have not the time, if they had the inclination, to investigate, so that when the proposition comes before the House they will have as broad and wide and large information as any member upon the Naval Committee. In other words, I propose that the House shall be fully informed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I felt confident that the position of the gentleman was as he has stated it, and he will pardon me for saying that I think by dignifying these cards he has attracted much more attention to them than they would have otherwise received. I do not believe that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] has been misled by them, nor do I think any member of the committee or the House will be misled by them, and I do not think the gentleman is doing either himself or his committee justice in leaving the impression in the minds of some, possibly, that the controversy over the construction of ships in Government navy-yards grew out of the action of the Vallejo Commercial Club, or Chamber of Commerce, or whatever

it may be.

Mr. FOSS. I only serve my purpose when I call the attention of the members of the House to the fact that these cards are not to be taken seriously. I feel that it is my duty as chairman of this committee to lay before the House all the information which I possess, in order that they may intelligently vote upon these questions, because I realize that in the multiplicity of the business which falls upon every member of the House he has not the time to study and investigate and ferret out all of these questions. believe that he looks to the chairman of a committee and to the members of a committee standing as representatives of the great naval establishment of our country to point out any defects which may appear in publication which may have a tendency to influence the members of the House, sent here, as these have been, week in and week out. I consider that it is his bounden duty not to withhold a single bit of information that would enlighten them and upon which it is necessary for them to have some understanding in order to vote intelligently. Now, gentlemen, I will not pursue this question further. So far as these cards are concerned, I think, in view of the fact that there are so many misstatements in them, they have not done the cause of building ships in navyyards one bit of good whatever.

Now, mind you, there has been another movement, and that is on the part of the labor unions of the country. They have sent resolutions and petitions here, and similar petitions have come also from the old soldiers to the members of this House, requesting the House to put a provision in the bill providing for the building of one or more ships in Government navy-yards. They have the sacred right of petition. I put them entirely upon a different footing than I do these gentlemen who send out these cards with a misstatement of the facts. They have made an appeal cards with a misstatement of the facts. They have made an appear along correct lines. They have had a hearing before the Naval Committee. We have considered their case, and I do not put them in the same category as the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce, which has been sending out these cards, which, according to our naval authorities, who are the best judges, contain a perversion of

facts and figures.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I stand here for every provision in this bill, including that one making it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Navy to build at least one ship in a Government navy-yard, because I think it is a good experiment to try.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. He can build them all there, can

he not?

Mr. FOSS. It is within his discretion to build them all there, but he must build one. The committee so decided it. It was not my judgment, but the committee having so decided it, and standing here as the representative of the committee, I am for the provision. Let there be no question about that. [Applause.] But when I say I am for this provision I propose to tell you, for it is only just that I should tell you, why we have heretofore been opposed to building ships in Government navy-yards. In the first place, we have tried the experiment. We have built in Government navy-yards the Maine, the Texas, the Raleigh, and the Cincinnati. Two were built in the New York Navy-Yard and two in the Norfolk Navy-Yard. The vessels were begun, according to Admiral Bowles's testimony, in 1888 to 1890, and he says:

I will compare them with the cost of vessels that were begun about the Mr. FOSS. It is within his discretion to build them all there,

Ing to Admirai Bowles's testimony, in 1888 to 1890, and ne says:

I will compare them with the cost of vessels that were begun about the same time. We have not their exact counterparts in the service anywhere, but it is fair to compare the Maine and the Texas with the Indiana, which was begun in 1891, and was the first of the modern battle ships.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Is the Indiana larger than either the Maine or the Texas

Mr. Bowles. Yes; the Indiana is rated at 10,288 tons and the Texas at 6,300, while the Maine is rated at 6,600 tons. The Maine cost somewhat more than the Texas, and I am going to take the Texas and the Raleigh, which we

built at Norfolk, for comparison, because I think it is a little more fair. The Texas was begun June 1, 1889, and she was commissioned in August, 1895. She was under construction, therefore, for six years. The Indiana was begun in May, 1891, and commissioned in November, 1895. She was under construction four years. The cost of the Texas for hull and machinery was \$2.950,000 approximately—almost \$3,000,000. The contract price for the Indiana for hull and machinery was \$3,063,000. That is the comparison that you usually hear, and people will tell you that a 6,000-ton ship built in the navy-yard costs as much as a 10,000-ton battle ship built outside.

Mr. VANDIVER. May I ask the chairman a question?
Mr. FOSS. Wait until I get through with this, if you will. I
do not mean to be discourteous.
Mr. VANDIVER. Certainly; neither do I.

Mr. FOSS (continuing the reading):

Taking the cost per ton of hull and machinery, of course, the Texas runs up to \$20 a ton, and in the Indiana it is \$538 a ton; so that the Texas, on that basis of comparison, costs 52 per cent per ton of the hull and machinery more than the Indiana.

Mr. VANDIVER. Just at that point.
Mr. FOSS (continuing). Then he goes on and makes a statement of the total cost of shipbuilding, after putting on the armor and the armament, showing that-

The cost of the *Indiana* on that basis was approximately \$6,000,000, and the cost of the *Texas* was \$4,200,000. The cost of the *Texas* per ton was \$819, and the cost of the *Indiana* per ton, completed, was \$669, so that the *Texas* cost more than the *Indiana* by 22.4 per cent per ton.

That was on the completed ship. Then also on the cost of the *Minneapolis* and the *Raleigh* he makes a comparison showing that on the hull and machinery alone it cost 70 per cent more to build the ship per ton in Government navy-yards than in private

yards—that is, simply on the hull and machinery.

Mr. VANDIVER. Now, if the gentleman will allow me?

Mr. MAYNARD. Is it not a fact that Constructor Bowles in that testimony says that in the construction of the Texas and the Raleigh and the Maine and Cincinnati that certain materials and tools were bought that were not consumed in the construction of the ships, but were charged to the ships; and would not that increase the relative cost?

Mr. FOSS. I think they spent in the neighborhood of \$125,000 to put the navy-yard in a little better shape.
Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. FOSS. Certainly.
Mr. HULL. The *Indiana* is not quite double, but over one-third larger than the *Maine* and the *Texas?*

Mr. FOSS. Yes, sir.

Is there an advantage in the cost per ton of build-Mr. HULL. ing a large ship over the cost per ton of building a small ship? In other words, take two ships, one of 10,500 tons and one of 6,500 tons; would it not cost less per ton to build the 10,500-ton ship than the 6,500 ton? I want to ask that information only.

Mr. FOSS. I do not know that I can state positively about that.
Mr. VANDIVER. Now, will the chairman yield to me for a question? I could not quite distinctly hear all that he was reading. Was the report that you were reading from a part of the hearing of Constructor Bowles?
Mr. FOSS. Yes.
Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. VANDIVER. At what time?
Mr. FOSS. This was in our hearings of the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. VANDIVER. A further question: Did not Constructor Bowles in that same hearing also explain why it was that a ship constructed in the navy-yard costs more than a ship constructed in the private yards, and did he not give it as his opinion at that time that the Government ought to build ships in the navy-yards? Mr. FOSS. Admiral Bowles at that time thought the Govern-

ment ought to build some ships in the navy-yards.

Mr. VANDIVER. That is the fact, and I think it ought to be brought out.

Mr. FOSS. It is true that the naval constructors are generally Mr. FOSS. It is true that the naval constructors are generally in favor of building ships in the navy-yards. It is their profession, it is their business, just as lawyers are in favor of trying cases, just as doctors desire patients, just as one professional or another is ambitious and is desirous to pursue his calling. I believe that universally the naval constructors are in favor of building ships, although Admiral Bowles said this. His latest testing mony upon this point is that it will cost the Government 25 per cent more to build ships in Government navy-yards than under private contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the agreement eached just prior to the House going into Committee of the Whole that to-day should be devoted to general debate, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Louisiana, and under that arrangement, as-suming that the committee will rise at 5 o'clock, the gentleman from Illinois has used one half of the time.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am content to concede all the time that my colleague requires to conclude his

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to

ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. FOSS. Very well.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois, and would like to know whether it is his opinion that it is to the advantage of the Government in letting its contracts for new ships to have yards in which may be constructed vessels independently of private contract.

Mr. FOSS. I think it is well for the Government to have a

few yards where, in case of necessity—in case of war—they could construct ships. But I think it would be a very extravagant policy to fit up all the navy-yards for the construction of ships.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. May we not get better figures in

private contracts by reason of the fact that we are competent and prepared to build ships ourselves?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; probably so. Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I think it ought to in a matter of

so great importance.

Mr. FOSS. Now, the reasons urged by those who contend that the Government can not build ships in the navy-yards cheaper than in private yards are these: First, I have shown by our experience that we have not been able to do it in the past. But perience that we have not been able to do it in the past. But gentlemen make the argument on the other side that the navy-yards were not in as good condition then as at the present time, and I concede to them that fact. If gentlemen will only stop to consider this question for a moment, they will see for themselves why it is that the navy-yards can not build ships as cheaply as they can be built under private contract. Take, for instance, the hours of labor. They work eight hours only in the navy-yards and nine and ten hours in the private yards. There is a difference of 20 per cent in the hours of labor. 20 per cent in the hours of labor.

Now, there is a difference in the amount of wages. Bowles says in his testimony, and it stands here uncontradicted, that we pay the laboring men in the navy-yards 30 or 40 per cent

more than in private yards.

Mr. METCALF. Let me ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under the rules of the Navy Department they are to pay in navy-yards of the country exactly the same wages as are paid in the same trades in the immediate vicinity, and is not that a rule rigidly enforced? I know it is as far as my part of the country is concerned, and that they are often paid less than they are paid in other branches in the same vicinity.

Mr. FOSS. Well, that is the statement of Admiral Bowles in

his testimony before the committee, and the gentleman can read

it for himself.

Mr. METCALF. I call the gentleman's attention to the rule of

the Department.

Mr. FOSS. I will yield to my colleague Mr. WATSON, who sits here, to read the testimony of Admiral Bowles.

Mr. WATSON. The Chairman asked the question of Admiral Bowles: How much more are the men getting in the navy-yards than in private yards? Admiral Bowles answered:

Comparing the wages of the navy-yard in Brooklyn and New York with the shipbuilding concerns of the Delaware, I imagine they are getting 35 to 40 per cent more.

The CHAIRMAN. More wages?

Admiral Bowles. Yes.

That is a fact, and I know of no ruling in the Navy Department

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the wages paid in the Brooklyn Navy-Yard are the average wages paid to a mechanic in the same branches in the immediate vicinity, and that is the course pursued throughout the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word further. not care to be interrupted, as I would like to finish my remarks this afternoon, so that the other side can go on. I have pointed out as one reason the difference in the hours of labor, eight to ten, and I have pointed out another reason for the difference in the cost, and that is 30 to 40 per cent more wages paid in the navy-yards than in the private yards. Now, I will point out another reason, and that is in private yards I think you will find they work

by the piece and in the Government yards they work by the day.

Then there is another reason why they can not build as cheaply in the Government yards, and that is, we give our employees in the navy-yards every holiday and pay them for it. Not only that, but we give them two weeks' leave of absence and pay them for that. There is another reason which enters into it, and that is, the Government can not buy material as cheaply as a private contractor. It can not go into the open market and buy material. It has no large sum of money by which it can take advantage of the market rates and provide for the future when materials are low in price. It has to buy from time to time, and has

usually paid pretty good rates for everything it wanted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman believe that private yards set aside large sums to buy material when material is low?

Mr. FOSS. They always have ready capital to do it with, and the Congress of the United States does not appropriate any more money for a department than it is obliged to. It never has any

ready capital.

Mr. WHEELER. As bearing somewhat on this question, I wish to ask the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] to the following provision, in lines 7 to 11, on page 73 of

The contract for the construction of each of said vessels so contracted for shall be awarded by the Secretary of the Navy to the lowest best responsible bidder, having in view the best results and most expeditious delivery, and not more than two of said battle ships and armored cruisers and not more than one of said gunboats herein provided for shall be built by one contracting party.

Is that a usual provision in bills of this character?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I think the usual provision.
Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman will remember that this particular language was not submitted to the committee; it was submitted to the gentleman from Ohio to lick into shape. I have

therefore asked whether that provision is usual.

Mr. FOSS. That, I think, is the usual provision. I think the gentleman will find it substantially in every naval appropriation

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out some of the reasons why, in my judgment, the Government yards can not build ships as cheaply as the private yards. I will rehearse those reasons:
First, the difference in the hours of labor; second, the difference

in wages; third, the loss of time in Government yards by holidays and by leaves of absence; fourth, impossibility of the Government buying material as cheaply as the private contractors; fifth, much of the work in the private yards is piecework, while in the Government yards work is done by the day.

But there are some other considerations that enter into this question. Suppose that the Government builds a ship as cheaply as the private contractor; but suppose that ship does not come up to the requirements as to speed, what are you going to do about it? The Government has built the ship, has paid for its construc-

tion, but there is no guaranty that the vessel shall be equal to the requirements of the Government. Where a ship is built under contract, there is an absolute guaranty on the part of the contractor, and if the ship does not fulfill the stipulations of the contract the Government says: "Away with your ship!" That is an important item to be taken into consideration.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio. On that point let me ask the gentleman this question: Has the Government within the last ten years ever refused to accept any ship from any private contractor because it did not come up to the contract, either in speed or otherwise?

Mr. FOSS. I do not know that such has been the fact. But I

think the Government has called upon the contractor to make good his contract or has insisted upon deductions from the contract price in case of any failure to conform to the requirements of the

Mr. FITZGERALD. And has not Congress universally re-

mitted such penalties?

Mr. COOMBS. As to cases where the Government has made deductions from the contract price because the contractor has failed to complete the vessel in accordance with the contract, is there not in this bill a provision for a refund in such cases of the money withheld by the Government?

Mr. FOSS. No. I would be glad if the gentleman would point out any such provision.

Mr. COOMBS. I thought there was such a provision. I pre-

sume I am mistaken.

Mr. RIXEY. Is it not the fact that the contractors for the torpedo-boat destroyers now claim that they have lost money upon that contract and have applied to the Navy Department to bear a portion of that loss, and has not the Navy Department recommended to Congress that the Government bear one-half the

Mr. FOSS. I think that is true; but that matter has never

been considered yet by our committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few words, in conclusion, in reference to this subject. I may say here, if gentlemen will not regard it as too personal to myself, that I made some study, not only in this country but abroad, of the building of ships in private yards and in Government yards. Some two years ago I visited all the great private yards of England and some of the other countries, and I visited also the Government navy-yards. I looked your confully into the question of the comparative of heald very carefully into the question of the comparative cost of build-

ing ships in Government yards and in private yards.

Up to 1896 there was no question that in England it cost more to build ships in Government yards than in private yards. From 1896 down, by reason of the fact that they have been perfecting their navy-yards, they have got to the point where the cost is about the same. Sometimes they will build a battle ship in a private yard which will cost more than a similar ship built in a government yard, and sometimes the reverse will happen.

But mark you the difference in conditions between foreign yards and our yards. In England the hours of labor in Government yards are the same as in private yards. Here the difference in hours of labor is as 8 to 10. The wages are about the same. In England the conditions of labor in Government yards and in

private yards are practically on the same footing.

That is the experience, too, I think, in France and also, I was about to say, in Germany. No, not in Germany. The information which I obtained on this subject when in Germany has been confirmed recently by the German secretary of the navy or minister of marine, with whom, when he was here a few months ago, I discussed this question. The experience in Germany to-day as to the comparative cost of building ships in private yards and in Government yards is that it costs from 10 per cent to 25 per cent more to build ships in Government yards than to construct them under private contract. And the other day when I made inquiry on this subject from one of the naval authorities of Russia, I was told that practically the same thing existed in that country.

And, mark you, in Germany they pay less to their men in Government yards than in private yards; and so they do in Russia; whereas in our own country the Government yards pay 30 or 40 per cent more. Besides, we give them leaves of absence, and give them two hours each day additional. Do you mean to say that if in foreign countries they can not build them as cheaply as under private contract when conditions are equal, we in our own country, where the conditions are unequal, can build them as cheaply

as under private contract?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman-The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. No.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to y
Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a moment. The gentleman declines to yield. build and continue to build them in Government yards?

Mr. FOSS: Oh, that is a question of policy.
Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is not the reason because it gives competition all the time, if they have the private yard and the Government yard?

Mr. FOSS. It may be that. It may be that their systems of government over there are more paternal than ours. It may be that here in this country we give scope to individual inventive genius, whereas over there it may be perchance their purpose to stifle it. Here we exalt the individual; there, the state. It may lie in the very foundation and construction of government, but I want to say to you, gentlemen, I have gone into a very careful consideration of the whole question, and I thought I ought in duty to you to present it carefully before you, so that you may get the result of what study and investigation a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs has made.

I want to say to you, however, that I do not believe we will be able to settle this question notwithstanding our past experience, although we have before us the light which comes from foreign countries, although we have all of the facts which may come from research and from study, I say I do not believe that we can settle this question which now vexes many minds unless we try the experiment of building at least one ship in a Government navy-yard. I may say that the Government navy-yards have plenty of employment for their labor to-day. The repair work which comes from the ships is enough to keep the men employed, and as we build up our Navy of course there will be more repair work to do. If you build a ship in a Government navy-yard, it will mean that you will have to take on perhaps a thousand or two thousand more men to build that ship, and after they become nicely settled in their homes—Vallejo, or in some other city dependent on Government work—then they will come and insist that you keep up the building of ships. Why? Because you attracted them there with the promise of Government work, and you can not go back on them then.

Now, there are all these questions to be taken into consideration; but I say to you, let us try the experiment. Let us settle the question so, notwithstanding the fact that I have presented a side of this question which may seem to be antagonistic to the proposition contended for in the bill, I felt that possibly nobody would say anything upon it unless I did, and I thought it was due to every member of the House to know both sides, because only after they knew both sides could they intelligently vote for But let no member of this committee or House think for one single moment that I do not stand here advocating the provision, because I think it is a wise provision to build at least one ship in a Government navy-yard, not only to solve for the country the question as to whether or not we have been paying exorbitant prices for our ships, but also to get some definite data before the country as to the relative cost of building them as a guidance for the future policy of the construction of the American Navy.

Gentlemen, I thank you for having listened to me as long as you have. I feel very much interested in this subject of build-

ing up the American Navy. I believe it is a wise policy. We must have a navy that is strong enough to maintain the honor of our country whenever and wherever that honor is assailed: we must have a navy strong enough to preserve our commerce and our merchant marine; we must have a navy strong enough also to stand back of the foreign policy of our Government and see to it that American rights are forever protected everywhere under the blue canopy of the sky. Because I am for the Navy, because I am for the construction of these mighty battle ships, because I am for all these things, it is my purpose and ambition to see to it that while they cost so much money, while they take out of the pockets of the people millions and millions of dollars, that it shall not ever be said or charged against the Naval Committee on the floor of the American Congress or anywhere else that one single dollar was ever extravagantly appropriated or did not go as far as it was possible to send it, but that in all our appropriations for the maintenance of this mighty naval establishment we have been economical, we have been wise, we have been judicious, and we have always had before our eyes the interests of the American people and of the American Republic. [Prolonged applause.]

APPENDIX.

[House Report No. 1792, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session.]

[House Report No. 1792, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred so much of the President's annual message as relates to the naval establishment, together with the annual estimates of the Navy Department, submit herewith a bill (H. R. 14946) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, with the following statement:

The amount carried by this bill is \$77,659,386.63.

Total estimates of the Department amounted to \$88,910,984.63, to which were added supplemental estimates to the amount of \$1,153,700 and additional estimates to the amount of \$5,000,000. The committee, after the most careful investigation of all of these estimates, having in view a careful and judicious expenditure of public money without in any way injuring the efficiency of the naval service, made deductions to the amount of \$27,405,298. This bill, as above stated, carries \$77,659,386.63, which is a decrease of appropriations over the naval appropriation act of last year of \$442,404.37.

The following table gives a comparative statement of the estimates of this year, the amounts appropriated last year, and the amounts embodied in this bill for the several bureaus and departments of the naval establishment:

Comparative statement.

Naval establishment.	Appropri-	Carried by	Estimates,
	ated, 1902.	DIII.	1903.
Pay of the Navy	915, 200, 284, 00	\$16,138,199.00	\$16, 498, 199, 0
Pay, miscellaneous		600,000,00	600,000.0
Contingent, Navy	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.0
Emarganov fund	250,000.00	100,000.00	
Emergency fund Bureau of Navigation	696, 625, 00	1,289,671.25	300,000.00
Dureau of Ondrana	000,020.00		986, 271. 2
Bureau of Ordnance	2,583,455.75	3,109,006.75	3,444,706.78 5,018,002.58
Bureau of Equipment	4,014,802.52	5,306,202.52 742,214.08	5,018,002.52
Bureau of Yards and Docks Public works—Bureau of Yards and	654,879.08	the week sure ser	784, 204. 08
Docks	6,775,010.00	6,561,075.00	20, 781, 375.00
Naval Academy Naval training station, Port	3,000,000.00	500,000.00	1,500,000.00
Royal			159,750.00
Naval training station, California Naval training station, Rhode	6,000.00	31,500.00	
Island	52, 170, 00	114, 280, 00	114, 280, 00
Naval War College		60,000.00	60,000,00
Public works—Bureau of Ordnance . Public works—Bureau of Equipment:	318, 100.00	392, 200.00	1,457,300.00
Depots for coal Defenses for insular naval sta-	750, 000.00		640,000.00
tions and coal depots			500,000,00
Naval Observatory	10,000.00	5,000.00	27,800.00
Hydrographic Office			230,000,00
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	210,000.00	280,000,00	245,000,00
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	3,543,849,28	3,808,932.28	4,367,590.28
Bureau of Construction and Repair.	7, 380, 824, 25	8,585,824.25	9, 925, 824, 25
Bureau of Steam Engineering	3,462,900.00	3,983,900.00	4, 289, 000, 00
Naval Academy	227, 115, 45	229, 905, 77	243, 705. 77
Marine Corps	2,798,520.27	2,938,465.73	2,993,465,7
Increase of Navy:	m, 100,000, m	W, 000, 200. 10	4,000, 100.10
Construction and machinery	21,000,000.00	13, 303, 010, 00	17 900 010 0
Armor and armament	4,000,000.00	9,000,000.00	17, 303, 010. 0
			6,000,000.00
Equipment	400,000.00	400,000.00	400,000.0
Equipping a navy-yard to build ships. To reimburse water fund, naval		175,000.00	
training station, California	6,459.32	******	
Blythe Island	2,000.00		
Blythe Island	149,571.08		
penses	2,000.00		
Ericsson, remit time penalties	17, 225.00		
Grand total	78, 101, 791.00	77, 659, 386, 63	98,910,984.60
PAY OF	THE NAVY.		
Pay of the Navy	e15 900 994 00	\$16,138,199.00	e16 406 100 00
	600 000 00		\$16,498,199.00
Pay, miscellaneous	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00
Contingent, Navy Emergency	19,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
Emergency	250,000.00	100,000.00	300,000.00
Total	16,060,284.00	16, 848, 199.00	17, 408, 199.00

Pay of the Navy in this bill is \$16,138,199, which is made up from the following table:
 Pay of 2.014 officers on the active list.
 \$4,667,166

 Commutation of quarters for officers
 200,000

 Pay of 572 naval cadets under instruction
 186,009

 Pay of 573 officers on the retired list
 1,357,321

 Pay of 575 officers
 200,000

Pay of 157 clerks.
Pay of 25,500 petty officers, seamen, and other enlisted men
Pay of 2,500 apprentice boys at training stations and on board training ships 8,820,000 ing ships.

Pay of enlisted men on the retired list.

Extra pay of petty officers and seamen reenlisting under honorable discharge. discharge
To pay interest on deposits by enlisted men, act February 9, 1889.

.. 16, 138, 199

Total. 16, 138, 199
This is an increase of \$937,915 over the appropriation for the same object last year, and is accounted for by the increased number of officers on the active list and the 3,000 additional men recommended by the committee for properly manning the new ships of the Navy.

Under "Pay, miscellaneous," the appropriation proposed in this bill is the same as that in the law of last year, but the emergency fund has been reduced to \$100,000.

There is a proviso attached to the emergency fund which will permit civilian employees performing duty at insular naval stations to be paid out of this fund until Congress shall make specific appropriation for them.

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

This Bureau has general jurisdiction over the officers and men of the Navy, their training and assignment; also the movement of vessels in the Navy and their complement of officers and men. It has charge of the compilation of the Naval Register and preparation, revision, and enforcement of all tactics, drill books, signal codes, cipher codes, and the uniform regulations. It also has general supervision of the Naval Academy and technical school for officers (except the War College and torpedo school).

The following is a statement of the estimates of the Bureau for the fiscal year 1903, with the appropriations carried by this bill and the appropriations for the current fiscal year:

Bureau of Navigation.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Transporting, recruiting, and con-			
_tingent	\$275,000.00	\$275,000.00	\$180,000.00
Gunnery exercises	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
Outfits for naval apprentices	117,000.00	117,000.00	117,000.00
Outfits for landsmen	225,000.00	225,000.00	225,000.00
Outfits on first enlistment Maintenance of colliers (under equip-	135,000.00	135,000.00	
ment last year)	350,000.00	350,000.00	350,000.00
Naval training station, California	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Naval training station, Rhode Island. Naval training station, Port Royal	56,600.00	55,000.00	45,000.00
8. C	45,000.00		
Naval War College, Rhode Island	14,246.25	14,246,25	11,200.00
Naval Home, Philadelphia	76, 425.00	76, 425.00	76, 425.00
Total	1,336,271.25	1,289,671.25	1,046,625.00

As will be seen from the above table there is an increase in appropriations over that of last year amounting to \$243,046.25. This is made up in two ways. First, by the increase in the appropriation for transportation and recruiting of men in consequence of the increase in the personnel, and, secondly, by the recommendation of the committee of an appropriation of \$135,000 for outfits for men on their first enlistment. It is believed by your committee that the expenditure of this amount will bring into the Navy a better class of men and at the same time insure fewer desertions.

There is a provision made in the bill for the appointment of a board of naval officers by the Secretary of the Navy to recommend a suitable site for a naval training station at some point on the Great Lakes, and having recommended such a site to estimate its value and ascertain the cost of its purchase and make a full and detailed report to Congress.

It is believed that the establishment of a naval training station on the lakes will have the effect of drawing into our Navy a great many strong and sturdy young men from the fields and farms of the Middle West who will make excellent seamen. It has frequently been said that our best men of to-day come from the interior, and more from that section of the country than all other sections combined.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

This Bureau has general charge of the ordnance of the Navy and the armor and armament of vessels, the torpedo station and magazines on shore, and designs the interior arrangements of all buildings erected for its use at navy-yards, as well as the machinery used for handling ammunition on ship, the interior of the turrets and the arrangement of guns, and the distribution of armor thereon. All torpedoes, powder, guns, and war explosives of all kinds, and armor plate, are boughtand manufactured under its supervision. It has control of all details of its own administration.

The following table gives the estimates for the next fiscal year and the amount carried by this bill and the amount appropriated last year:

Bureau of Ordnance.

	Estimates, 1908.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Ordnance and ordnance stores	\$800,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$500,000.00
Reserve supply ammunition	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
Conversion of guns Purchase and manufacture smoke-	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00
less powder	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00
Battery for Newark	175,000.00	175,000.00	
Batteries for New Orleans and Al-		The same of the same of	
bany	200,000.00	200,000.00	
Cranes, Portsmouth	10,000.00		
Machine tools, Boston	5,000.00		
Cranes, Boston	10,000.00		
Equipment storehouse, New York Machinery, proposed gun factory,	11,000.00	11,000.00	
Washington	59,000.00		100,000.00

Bureau of Ordnance-Continued.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
			-
Steel-casting plant, Washington	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	
Chemical laboratory	5,000.00	5,000.00	
Machine tools, Pensacola	12,000.00	12,000.00	
Machine tools, Puget Sound	50,000.00	50,000.00	
Cranes, Puget Sound	10,000.00		
Machinery, Washington	50,000.00	50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Coal machinery			9,849.00
Equipment forge shop, gun factory.			49,000,00
Tools, Mare Island			24,000,00
New batteries, Baltimore			175,000.00
Reserve guns for auxiliary cruisers .	259,000.00	259,000,00	250, 000, 00
Reserve guns for ships of Navy	500,000.00	250,000,00	1600,000,00
Torpedo station, Newport	65,000.00	65,000.00	65,000.00
Armory and equipment, Naval Mili-	00,000,00	00,000,00	00,000.00
tia .	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000,00
Arms and equipment of Marine	00,000.00	00,000.00	00,000.00
Corps			100,000.00
Navai proving ground			
Naval station, Puget Sound			25,000.00
		00,000,00	/18,000.00
Repairs	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
Miscellaneous items	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
Civil establishments	41, 706. 75	41,006.75	36,606.75
Total	3, 444, 706. 75	3,109,006.75	2,583,455.75

It will be seen from the above table that there is an increase in the amount of appropriations for this Bureau over that of last year of \$525,551. This is due to an increase in the appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores and for target practice of \$300,000 over that of the previous year. Last year the appropriation was not enough, and consequently the Department has had to ask for a deficiency appropriation of \$300,000 to carry on the work of the Bureau. The importance of target practice can not be overestimated. We may have ships and we may have men, but if the men are not trained by constant target practice to use the guns on our ships, then, in the stress of war, we will, when perchance too late, realize our weakness. The one thing which so marked the superiority of our men over that of the Spaniards in the recent war was their gunnery. Admiral O'Neil estimates that the total cost of target practice for all vessels of the Navy per annum is nearly \$900,000, or, allowing for a certain number of vessels out of commission, approximately \$750,000, and yet the amount allowed is not nearly as great as that allowed in some of the foreign navies.

The next important item in this Bureau, showing an increase over that of last year, is an appropriation of \$175,000 for a new and improved battery for the Nevark, a cruiser built in 1890, which has an antiquated battery and one by no means equal in efficiency to the later types. It is recommended that she be given a new battery, and also an appropriation of \$200,000 is recommended for new and improved battery. The batteries on the New Orleans and the Albany, two vessels built in England for Brazil, but purchased at the outbreak of the Spanish war by the United States. The batteries on these vessels differ from those used on our own, requiring special ammunition, and it is a source of great inconvenience to keep them supplied. It is believed by the Department that they should carry the standard United States Navy guns.

The next new and important item in this Bureau i

BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT.

The duties of this Bureau consist in furnishing the coal and general equipment of vessels. It also has charge of the manufacture of rope, anchors, cables, rigging, sails, galleys, and cooking utensils, and a portion of the electrical machinery for ships; also of the Naval Observatory, Nautical Almanac, and compass offices, and all details of its own administration.

The following table shows the estimates, the amount of appropriation proposed in the bill, and amount carried by the last appropriation act:

Bureau of Equipment.

	Estimates, 1908.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Coal and transportation	\$2,500,000.00 2,000,000.00 100,000.00 350,000.00 35,000.00 33,002.52	\$2,500,000.00 2,000,000.00 100,000.00 640,000.00 35,000.00 31,202.52	\$2,000,000.00 1,500,000.00 100,000.00 750,000.00 350,000.00 35,000.00 29,802.53
Total		5, 306, 202. 52	4,764,802.52

It will be seen from the above that there is an increase of \$541,400 over that provided for last year. The increase in the appropriation recommended this year under this Bureau is due practically to two items, the first being that for coal and transportation of \$2,500,000, which is an increase over that of last year of \$500,000. In the urgent deficiency bill of this year an appropriation of \$300,000 was asked for in order to provide fully for our ships. During the last fiscal year the Bureau of Equipment purchased \$24,108 tons of coal, costing \$2,278,111.81.

There is an increase in the next item of equipment of vessels of \$500,000, due to the necessities of an enlarged Navy. A deficiency of \$450,000 in the bill was asked for this year in addition to that of \$1,500,000 appropriated last year. It will be seen that the item for coal depots has been reduced \$110,000. The other items under this Bureau are practically the same as last year.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

This is the civil engineering bureau of the Department, and has charge of the construction of buildings and their maintenance in the several navy-yards, also of all docks and shore structures of all kinds, such as quay walls, wharfs, etc., for which it estimates. It also has charge of all topographical improvements in such yards. Newport, R. I., Annapolis, Md., and the Naval

Home, Philadelphia, the magazines and hospitals outside of navy-yards and the buildings for which it does not estimate being excepted from its jurisdiction. The part of the naval appropriation bill under public works is estimated for by this Bureau.

The following table shows the estimates for the fiscal year 1903, the proposed appropriation in this bill, and the amount carried by the last appropriation act:

Bureau of Yards and Docks.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Maintenance of yards and docks Contingent	\$600,000.00 50,000.00 134,204.08	\$600,000.00 40,000.00 102,214.08	\$500,000.00 50,000.00 104,879.08
Total	784, 204. 08	742,214.08	654, 879. 08

As will be seen, there is an increase of \$90,000 in this Bureau over the act of last year. Practically all of this is due to the necessity for increased number of employees in consequence of the action of Congress in giving two weeks' leave of absence to employees in the navy-yards. The item for contingent expenses has been reduced \$10,000.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amounts carried by this bill, and those appropriated for the present fiscal year:

Bureau of Yards and Docks.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Portsmouth Boston Narragansett	\$1,947,575 1,570,200 200,000	\$672,075 702,700	\$364,850 551,000
New London New York League Island Washington Norfolk	51,000 3,475,000 741,300 622,000 1,511,000	41,000 499,000 447,300 240,000 344,000	1,009,000 695,230 318,210 594,260
Key West Mare Island Puget Sound Porto Rico Pensacola New Orleans	1,169,500 2,613,000 995,800	93,000 225,500 748,500 50,000 2,500 339,000	144,000 331,660 273,000 40,000 41,500 330,000
Dry Tortugas. Four dry docks Hawaii Tutuila	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,000,000 1,000,000 107,300 225,000
Charleston Repairs and preservation of yards Cavite Olongapo Guam	381,000 1,443,000	250,000 500,000 233,500	150,000 500,000
Plans		30,000 6,561,075	6,775,010

The estimates call for the sum of \$20,781,375. Your committee after most careful investigation of the above items reduced them \$14,220,300, leaving \$6,561,075, which it recommends for public improvements in our yards and stations during the present year. Heretofore Congress has authorized the construction of many new buildings at our different stations, and it is thought advisable this year to complete these first before entering upon new constructions, and this is the policy which has been carried into effect except in a few yards, notably that of Algiers, which is a new naval station and requires the building of some shops, and also at Puget Sound, which is also comparatively a new station and is growing rapidly in importance. The estimates were sent in by the Department for a naval station at San Juan, P. R., to the amount of \$2,613,000, but the committee thought it would be wise not to provide for any naval station in the West Indies until they had more definite knowledge as to the best location for one.

Estimates for a naval station at Olongapo, P. I., to the amount of \$1,443,000, were also cut out for practically the same reason. It is believed for the present we can get along with the old Spanish naval stations at Cavite, and accordingly the committee has made some recommendations for that station, notably \$200,000, toward the purchase of a steel floating dock, which can be used there or wherever it may hereafter be deemed advisable to build a navy-yard. Estimates for housing and storing torpedo vessels at Boston, to cost \$550,000; at New York, to cost the same; at Charleston, S. C., the same; at Penscola, to cost \$550,000; at Mare Island, \$250,000; at New York, \$2,000,000; other items, such as the purchase of land at New York, \$2,000,000; other items, such as the purchase of land at New York, \$2,000,000; at More of the tems, to cost, in all, at New York, \$500,000; at League Island, \$350,000; at Mare Island, \$350,000; at Mare Island, where from \$150,000 to \$900,000, were all of them considered by the co

Under this Bureau the committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,050,000 for the completion of the four dry docks at Portsmouth, Boston, League Island, and Mare Island, which are now in process of construction.

It may be of interest to members of the House to know the value of the real estate, chattels, and machinery plants at the various yards and stations, and accordingly the following table is inserted:

Statement showing the value of real estate and chattels and machinery plant at the several navy-yards and stations, June 30, 1901.

Navy-yard and stations.	Real estate and chattels.	Machinery plants.
Navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H	\$3,070,842.05	\$473,896.69
Navy-yard, Boston, Mass	12,712,149.23 245.173.07	844, 925, 85 59, 746, 83
Naval training station, Newport, R. I	496, 804. 57	11,006.97
Naval War College, Newport, R. I.	101,061.66 278,992.38	795, 00
Naval station, New London, Conn Navy-yard, New York	21,306,010.37	1,488,374.99
Navy-yard, League Island, Pa	3,562,722.56	325, 802. 68

Statement showing the value of real estate, chattels, etc.-Continued.

Navy-yard and stations.	Real estate and chattels.	Machinery plants.
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md	870, 291. 13	\$23, 150. 5 5
Navy-yard, Washington, D. C	5,087,815.72 221,639.83	2,107,198.52
Naval proving ground, Indian Head, Md Navv-vard, Norfolk, Va.	597, 658, 59	76, 894. 51 863, 164. 57
Naval station, Port Royal, S. C. Naval station, Key West, Fia.	1,079,771.37 851,069.53	70,398.56 48,005.81
Navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal	5, 387, 301, 86	134,580.94 660,146.49
Naval training station, San Francisco, Cal Naval station, Puget Sound, Wash	941, 993, 80	255, 122. 21
Sacketts Harbor, N. Y Naval station, San Juan, P. R	202, 236, 93	7,608.42
Island of Guam Naval station, Cavite, P. I	50, 512, 39 1, 645, 209, 80 662, 933, 46	128, 632, 13
Algiers, La Pago Pago, Samoa Japonski Island, Alaska	112, 101, 55	
Frenchmans Bay, Maine	109, 762, 47	
Honolulu, H. I Pichilingue, Mexico Portsmouth Grove, R. I	1 25 709 00	
Yokohama, Japan	36,542.71	
Total	71, 409, 162. 21	7,559,451.72

PUBLIC WORKS (BUREAU OF NAVIGATION).

The following table gives the estimates for 1903, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Public works, Bureau of Navigation.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Naval Academy. Naval training station, California. Naval training station, Rhode Island. Naval training station, Port Royal. Naval War College.	\$1,500,000 31,500 114,280 159,750 60,000	\$500,000 31,500 114,280 60,000	\$3,000,000 6,000 52,170
Total	1,865,530	705,780	3,058,170

NAVAL ACADEMY.

NAVAL ACADEMY.

By act of Congress June 7, 1900, the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to complete plans "covering all contemplated buildings and improvements at the Naval Academy and for each and every purpose connected therewith, which plans shall involve the total expenditure of not more than \$8,000,000." And it was further provided—

"That after the preparation and approval of the plans * * the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for any part or all of the improvements and buildings herein authorized within said limit of cost, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law."

by law.

Accordingly such plans were completed and approved by the Secretary of the Navy on October 3, 1900, and contracts have been let for most of the

the Navy on October 3, 1900, and contracts have been let for most of the buildings.

The armory and the boathouse are nearly finished; the contract has been let for cadets' quarters, which will cost \$2,248,000, accommodating 1,200 cadets; the foundations of the marine engineering building are now being constructed; the gymnasium and officers' quarters will be under contract by June 1, as will also be the building known as the officers' mess, and plans for the sea-wall work are now practically completed and will be advertised in a short time.

The following is a statement of the appropriations which have been made for the rebuilding of the Naval Academy:

ı	for the rebuilding of the Naval Academy:	
	By act of May 4, 1898 By act of March 3, 1899 By act of June 7, 1900	720,000 350,000
I	By act of March 3, 1901.	3,000,000

Total appropriated.

There has been expended up to date \$1.192,148.11. The payments to be made between now and the 1st of July will bring the expenditures up to \$2.094,934.37, leaving on July 1 an unexpended balance of \$2.500,000. This unexpended balance, with a further appropriation of \$500,000 recommended in this bill, will be necessary to meet the payments due on contracts made and to be made during the coming fiscal year.

There is further provided under the head of "Public works, Bureau of Navigation," improvements and buildings for the naval training station in California, \$31,500, and also some improvements at the training station in California, \$31,500, and also some improvements at the training station, Rhode Island, costing \$114,280. Annex to the present building at the Naval War College in Rhode Island to cost \$600,000 has been recommended by the general board as necessary for the performance of the important work of the college where war plans and schemes of campaign and the study of the art of war in its broadest and highest sense are carried on.

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

The following table shows the estimates of this year, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Public works, Bureau of Ordnance.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1903.	Appropriated, 1902.
Naval magazine, Iona Island Naval magazine, Dover Naval magazine, Fort Mifflin Naval magazine, Norfolk Naval torpedo station, Newport Naval proving ground, Indian Head. Naval magazine, Portsmouth	\$49,500 93,800 5,000 117,500 32,000 27,000 400,000	\$49,500 80,000 5,000 46,500 28,000 23,000	\$100,000 65,000 56,000 60,500 25,000 11,600

Public works, Bureau of Ordnance-Continued.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill, 1908.	Appropriated, 1902.
Naval magazine, Boston Naval shell house, Chelsea Naval quarters, Rose Island Naval magazine, Fort Lafayette Water system, Fort Norfolk St. Helena, Norfolk Naval magazine, Man Island Naval magazine, Puget Sound	\$500,000 8,000 5,200 35,000 2,000 2,300 80,000 100,000	\$5,200 25,000 80,000 50,000	
Total	1,457,300	392,200	\$318,100

It will be seen that there is a slight increase over that appropriated last year of \$74,100. Some improvements are asked for at the different magazines, as shown in the above table. Among the estimates were recommendations from the Department for a naval magazine at Portsmouth approximately to cost \$400,000, and Boston \$500,000; but in view of the fact that these two navy-yards are within short distances of each other, about 40 miles apart, it is thought that possibly one magazine might answer for both, and accordingly the provision authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board of naval officers to recommend a site or sites for one naval magazine on the New England coast and to make report to Congress at its next session is placed in this bill.

NAVAL OBSERVATORY.

The appropriation for the maintenance of the grounds and roads of the Naval Observatory which heretofore has been \$10,000 per year is reduced to one-half the amount, \$5,000.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

The duties of this Bureau are implied in its title, and comprise all that relates to the laboratories, naval hospitals, and dispensaries. It designs various buildings erected within the navy-yards for its own purposes, so far as their internal arrangements are concerned, and has control of the same after completion. It designs, builds, and maintains all buildings erected for its own purposes outside of navy-yards, and, generally, estimates for and controls all the details of its own organization.

The following table shows the estimates of 1908, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Medical department Naval hospital fund Contingent Repairs Naval hospital, Rhode Island	\$100,000 40,000 35,000 20,000	\$125,000 40,000 35,000 30,000	\$95,000 40,000 35,000 20,000
Naval hospital, Canacao	50,000	50,000	20,000
Total	245,000	280,000	210,000

It will be seen that there is an increase of \$70,000 in the above table, \$30,000 of which is due to increased necessity for supplies for our officers and men and atour navy-yards and stations. There is recommended an appropriation of \$50,000 for a naval hospital at Canacao, P. I., which is strongly urged by

the Bureau.

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

Generally speaking, this is the financial bureau of the Department. Its duties comprise all that relates to requiring for or preparing provisions, clothing, small stores, and contingent stores of the Pay Department; the purchase of all supplies for the naval establishment, except medical and surgical appliances, and instruments and supplies for the Marine Corps, and the keeping of a proper system of accounts of the same. Like the other bureaus, it estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following statement shows the estimates, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year:

Supplies and accounts.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Provisions, Navy Contingent Civil establishment	\$4,000,000.00 250,000.00 117,590.00		\$3,250,000.00 200,000.00 93,849.28
Total	4,367,590.00	3,803,932.28	3,543,849.28

It will be seen from the above table that the increased appropriations recommended this year over that made last year are \$20,083. The item of provisions for the Navy is increased from \$3,250,000 to \$3,500,000. This is due to the fact that under this bill we are providing for 3,000 additional men, and it will be necessary to provide for their necessities. The item for contingent is the same as that of last year, but there is a small increase of approximately \$10,000 under the civil establishment for the navy-yard at Puget Sound and the naval station at Key West.

NAVY RATION.

Under this Bureau is inserted an amendment to section 1580 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to provide for a new navy ration. The Secretary of the Navy ordered a board to investigate the whole subject and make report, which has been done in a separate communication referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The present ration has been substantially without change since it was established in July, 1861. The Secretary, in his report save.

without change since it was established in July, 1881. The Secretary, in his report, says:

"The board recommends the legislation that will give to the crews of our ships a liberal and proper amount under any and all conditions of service without compelling them to contribute to their own subsistence, as at present. The changes recommended are approved and would make the cost of the ration about 30 cents per man per diem, which is now its nominal commutation value. At present the actual cost of the ration is from 21 to 22 cents."

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

The duties of this Bureau comprise all that relate to the designing, building, fitting, and repairing the hulls of ships, their turrets, spars, capstans,

windlasses, steering gear, and ventilating apparatus, and, in conjunction with the Bureau of Ordnance, designing the construction of ammunition hoists, their shafts, machinery, and appurtenances; placing and securing armor; placing and securing on board ship the armament and its accessories as manufactured and supplied by the Bureau of Ordnance. It has charge of the care and preservation of ships in reserve, the docking of ships, the designing of slips, and the internal arrangement of the various buildings and shops under its control, and estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for 1902:

Construction and repair.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Construction and repair of vessels Improvements, construction plants:	\$9,000,000.00	\$8,000,000.00	\$7,000,000.00
Portsmouth	30,000.00	30,000.00	50,000,00
Boston	50,000,00	50,000,00	50,000.00
New York	50,000,00	50,000,00	25,000.00
League Island.	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Norfolk	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Pensacola			15,000.00
Mare Island	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
Puget Sound	75,000.00	75,000.00	30,000.00
New Orleans	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00
Charleston	50,000.00		
Philippines Derrick, New York	50,000.00	50,000.00	
Derrick, New York	35,000.00		
Derrick, Cavite	45,000.00		
Lighters, Mare Island	70,000.00		
Four steel tugs	280,000.00	140,000.00	
Civil establishment.	25,824.25	25, 824. 25	25, 824. 25
Total	9, 925, 824. 25	8,585,824.25	7, 360, 824, 25

It will be seen from the above table that there is an increase under this Bureau of \$1,225,000, which is largely made up from the necessity for the increase in the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the repair of our vessels, which are increasing in number each year. A new item was inserted for \$50,000 for a construction plant at Cavite, P. I., and also an appropriation of \$140,000 for two steel tugs, necessary for the general service of the navy-yards at home stations. The items under the civil establishment of the Bureau are practically the same as those of last year.

BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

The duties of this Bureau comprise all that relates to designing, build-

The duties of this Bureau comprise all that relates to designing, building, fitting out, and repairing the machinery for which steam is the motive power on board ship. Like the other bureaus, it designs the internal arrangement of its various shops at the navy-yard and estimates for and controls its own administration.

The following table shows the estimates for the fiscal year 1903, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year:

Steam engineering.

	Estimates, 1903	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Steam machinery	\$3,450,000 1,000	\$3,405,000 1,000	\$3,245,000 1,000
Portsmouth teague Island Norfolk Mare Island	100,000 180,000 25,000 80,000	130,000 25,000 80,000	100,000
Puget Sound	125,000 400,000 23,000	125,000 200,000 17,900	16,900
Total	4,289,000	3,983,900	3,462,900

The above table shows an increase of appropriations to the amount of \$521,000. As will be seen, there is an increase of \$150,000 in the first item under this Bureau for the completion, repairing, and preservation of machinery and boilers of vessels, etc. There is also an appropriation for the equipment of the new steam engineering shops at League Island, Mare Island, and Puget Sound. An experimental station and testing laboratory for the Bureau of Steam Engineering has been strongly recommended by the Department and the Secretary of the Navy, and after carefully considering the same the committee has inserted an appropriation in this bill for its establishment.

The appropriation of the civil establishment of the Bureau of Steam Engineering is increased only by \$1,000 over that of last year.

NAVAL ACADEMY (CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT).

The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amount carried by the bill, and the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1902:

Naval Academy.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Pay of professors and others Pay of watchmen, mechanics, and	\$68,991.00	\$55,191.00	\$55, 191.00
others	46, 259. 95 11, 154. 82	46, 259. 95 11, 154, 82	44, 799, 95 7, 824, 50
Cat boats	4,500.00	4,500.00	4,500.00
Repairs	31,000.00	31,000.00	51,000.00
Heating and lighting Contingent	20,000.00 61,800.00	20,000.00 61,800.00	20,000.00 43,800.00
Total	243, 705. 77	229, 905.77	227, 115. 45

The amounts of these appropriations are practically the same as those of last year, in some cases there being reductions and in others increases; but the totals are about the same. Under this Bureau an insertion is made for the appointment of 500 additional cadets,

MORE OFFICERS.

Of course everyone must realize that we can not go on building up the matériel of the Navy without at the same time increasing the personnel. If

we build ships, we must also provide for officers and men to man them. The former are absolutely useless without the latter. The Secretary in his report calls special attention to the need of more line officers, and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in his report, in which he considers the subject exhaustively, says:

"The ever-increasing need of line officers has made itself felt with augmented force during the past fiscal year. At no time in the history of the Navy has such a condition held as now exists. If the Department were suddenly called upon to man for war service all the vessels available in the navy-yards, it would be confronted with a requirement impossible to meet. It is a fact that there are not enough line officers of the Navy to man the vessels already constructed. This being the case, the Bureau need scarcely call attention to the state of affairs which will exist in about three years when the vessels now under construction will be completed. In order to make plain the need for officers, the subject must be approached in a logical manner, and to do this we must consider the needs of each ship constructed and under construction.

and to do this we must constant a construction.

"Taking then the sum of the needs of the individual ships, we reach the needs of the service, considering incidentally the need for a reserve, and other reasons which will prevent the total number of officers on the list from actually serving on board ship in time of war. To this end the following is

Line officers required to man a battle ship.

commanding officer. executive officer. chief engineer.

1 navigating officer.
6 turret officers.
2 secondary battery officers.
3 powder division officers.
2 assistants to chief engineer.

"In order to make plain that the above table is the lowest possible estimate of officers actually needed on board battle ships, there is furnished the following table showing the number of officers actually placed on board ships of similar displacement by foreign powers:

Nation and ship.	Number of line officers.	Remarks.
England, Barfleur France, Bouvet. Germany, Kaiser Friederich III	33 26 20	Includes midshipmen. Do. In addition to this there are a number of midshipmen not given here.

"It will be seen at a glance in comparing the above table with the first table that the Bureau's estimate, which includes cadets, is at least 30 per cent smaller than actual conditions now existing in other navies.

"In preparing the following tables the Bureau has estimated for the smaller vessels by assigning to them complements of officers such as are actually carried by vessels now in service and of equal displacement. Without going into details it will be readily seen that the Bureau's estimates in these cases are also a minimum. The following tables show the number of officers which would be required on July 1, 1904, to man the ships of the Navy then actually completed, Table A showing the officers needed for vessels which have been commissioned, but which are now out of commission for repairs or in reserve; Table B showing the officers needed for vessels now under construction, but which will be completed by July 1, 1904:

	1	L.	
Vessels.	Officers.	Vessels.	Officers.
Texas Columbia Minneapolis Baltimore San Francisco Newark Olympis Cincinnati Raleigh Detroit Montgomery Marblehead Bennington	14 12 12 12 12 12 10 10	Boston Puritan Miantonomoh Terror Katahdin Mohican 10 torpedo boats.	100 8 8 8 8 6 6 20 215 53 268

);	
Vessels.	Officers.	Vessels.	Officers.
Maine Missouri Georgia Now Jorsey Pennsylvania Virginia Rhode Island Ohio California Nebraska West Virginia	17	Chattanooga Cleveland Galveston Tacoma Arkansas Nevada Florida Wyoming 16 torpedo-boat destroyers. 15 torpedo boats 7 submarines	12 12 7 7 7 7 7 7 48 30
Maryland Colorado South Dakota	15 15	25 per cent reserve	447 111
St. Louis	12 12	Total	558
Charleston Denver Des Moines	12 12 12	Grand total	826

[&]quot;Attention is invited to the fact that the above estimates do not include officers to man auxiliary vessels which must be used in time of war, such as scouts, Yale and Harvard type; colliers, supply vessels, refrigerating ships, repair ships, hospital ships, auxiliary gunboats, the Gloucester and Scorpion

type, and many other similar important craft. Allowing without any reserve that 200 officers would be necessary to man these auxiliary vessels, the total number of officers necessary in order to send to sea the navy which Congress has ordered constructed will be \$26 plus 200, or 1,025."

During the consideration of this subject your committee called upon the Department to furnish a statement of the number and duties of the present officers of the Navy. The following statement was furnished, which shows that there are 1,017 line officers, including the cadets, 993 of whom are eligible for sea duty, 709 of whom are on board vessels at the present time or doing duty upon seas, 272 performing duty on shore, 11 on the sick list, and 1 on the waiting list:

Grade.	Total num- ber in grade.	Number in grade who are eligible for sea duty.	Number perform- ing duty on board vessels or beyond seas.	perform-	On siek list.	On wait- ing or- ders.
Line. Admiral Rear-admirals Captains Commanders Lieutenant-commanders Lieutenants Lieute	1 32 75 118 176 306 69 126 124	2 22 71 108 175 302 69 126 124	8 33 49 114 520 35 126 124	1 13 *37 *51 *57 480 33	1 3 4 2 1	
Total	1,017	993	709	272	11	1

In addition to this number, 4 other officers, not eligible for sea duty, are

*In addition to this number, 4 other officers, not eligible for sea duty, are performing duty on shore.

b In addition to this number, 15 other officers, not eligible for sea duty, are performing duty on shore.

cIn addition to this number, 1 other officer, not eligible for sea duty, is performing duty on shore.

dIn addition to this number, 4 other officers, not eligible for sea duty, are performing duty on shore.

It will be seen from the above that we have comparatively few officers that we could call upon to man the new ships now being constructed and at the same time keep in commission those already built. Your committee saw but one remedy to meet the problem of more officers, and that was to increase the number of cadets at the Naval Academy, and accordingly a provision has been inserted in the bill providing for the appointment of 500 additional cadets, 125 each year during the next four years succeeding the passage of this act. Each Senator, Member, and Delegate of the House of Representatives is to have the appointment of 1 and the President 24. For the first year each Senator makes an appointment, and the President one-fourth of those allotted to him, and a sufficient number by Members and Delegates to bring the total up to 125. During each succeeding year the President appoints one-fourth of the number allotted to him and Members and Delegates enough to bring the total up to 125 for each year. This, it will be seen, is a temporary measure, and is in effect only for four years. After that time it is hoped that the present law, which provides for the appointment of a cadet by each Member and Delegate every four years, will produce a sufficient number of officers to satisfy the demands of our growing Navy.

MORE MEN.

MORE MEN.

The Chief of the Bureau of Navigation has set forth in a communication to the committee the necessity for the enlistment of more men. He estimates that to provide for the manning of our ships now under construction we will need approximately 14,000 men. Under the appropriation act of last year we provided 5,000 of these, who are now under training, and in this year's bill we have made a further increase of 3,000, which is all that will be necessary at the present time.

MARINE CORPS.

The Marine Corps is the military branch of the naval service. The following table shows the estimates for 1903, the amounts carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year:

Marine Corps.

	Estimated, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Pay Provisions Clothing Fuel Fuel Fuel Repair of barracks Forage Hire of quarters Contingent Public works	349,000.00 35,000.00 40,297.00 100,000.00 50,000.00 6,000.00 20,748.00	\$1,707,649.23 396,071.50 340,000.00 35,000.00 40,297.00 100,000.00 50,500.00 20,748.00 91,700.00 145,500.00	\$1,706,504.23 371,071.50 290,139.54 30,000.00 46,297.00 70,000.00 24,000.00 6,000.00 14,748.00 61,700.00 178,000.00
Total	2,993,465.73	2,938,465.73	2,798,520.27

From the above table it will be seen that there is an increase of \$139,945.46

From the above table it will be seen that there is an increase of \$139,95.49 over that of last year.

There is an increase of \$25,000 under the item of provisions and also approximately \$50,000 under that of clothing and \$30,000 under that of transportation and recruiting, which are regarded necessary by the commandant of the Marine Corps. An increase in the contingent item of \$30,000 is also recommended, but a reduction has been made in the public works of approximately \$33,000.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

The provision for the increase of the Navy is the last general heading of the naval appropriation bill, and one which, perhaps, excites the most pop-ular interest, inasmuch as it provides for the further construction of ships already authorized and the naval programme.

The following table shows the estimates for this year, the amount carried by this bill, and the amount appropriated last year:

Increase of the Navy.

	Estimates, 1903.	Carried by bill.	Appropriated, 1902.
Construction and machinery Armor and armament Equipment Equipment analy-yards	\$17,308,010 6,000,000 400,000	\$13,303,610 9,000,000 400,000 175,000	\$21,000,000 4,000,000 400,000

As will be seen from the above table, there is a reduction of \$4,000,000 from the estimates in the item of construction and machinery for work on new vessels already authorized. The Chief Constructor and the Chief Engineer reported to the committee that owing to the delay in the delivery of material, strikes, and other causes the work on vessels building has not progressed as rapidly as anticipated at the time the estimates were submitted, and accordingly the reduction above mentioned has been made.

The following table shows the ships now in process of construction and the degree of their completion on April 1, 1902.

Vessel.	Speed.	Builders.	Degree of com- pletion Apr. 1.
BATTLE SHIPS. No. 10. Maine No. 11. Missouri No. 12. Ohio No. 13. Virginia No. 14. Nebraska No. 15. Georgia No. 16. New Jersey No. 17. Rhode Island ARMORED CRUISERS. No. 4. Pennsylvania No. 5. West Virginia No. 6. California No. 7. Colorado No. 8. Maryland No. 9. South Dakota	19	Cramp & Sons. Newport News Co Union Iron Works Newport News Co. Moran Brothers Co Bath Iron Works Fore River Ship and Engine Co. do Cramp & Sons Newport News Co. Union Iron Works Cramp & Sons. Newport News Co. Union Iron Works Cramp & Sons. Newport News Co. Union Iron Works Cramp & Sons. Newport News Co. Union Iron Works	Per cent. 87 60 56 0 0 0 8 7 7 7
PROTECTED CRUISERS.			
No. 14. Denver		Neafle & Levy Fore River Ship and Engine Co. Lewis Nixon Wm R. Trigg Co Union Iron Works Bath Iron Works Neafle & Levy Union Iron Works Newport News Co.	77 67 58 56 41 78 8
	29	Newport News Co	2
MONITORS. No. 7. Arkansas No. 8. Nevada No. 9. Florida No. 10. Wyoming TORPEDO-BOATDESTROYERS.	12 12 12 12 12	Newport News Co Bate Iron Works Lewis Nixon Union Iron Works	94 93 90 81
No. 1. Bainbridge	29 29 29 28 29 29 29	Neafie & LevydododoWm. R. Trigg CoHarlan & Hollingsworthdofore River Ship and En-	99 99 99 98 84 82 99
No. 9. McDonough No. 10. Paul Jones No. 11. Perry No. 12. Preble No. 13. Stewart No. 14. Truxton No. 15. Whipple No. 15. Worden	30 29 29 29 29 29 30 30 30	gme Codo Union Iron Worksdodo	98 87 93 90 66 88 85
TORPEDO BOATS. No. 19. Stringham No. 20. Goldsborough No. 27. Blakely No. 23. De Long No. 29. Nicholson No. 30. O'Brien No. 34. Thornton No. 34. Thornton No. 35. Wilkes SUBMARINE TORPEDO	30 30 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26	Harlan & Hollingsworth Wolff & Zwicker. Geo. Lawley & Sondo Lewis Nixondo Wm. R. Trigg Co. Columbian Iron Works Gas Engine and Power Co.	98- 94- 98- 98- 98- 98- 98- 98- 74- 96
BOATS. No. 1. Plunger No. 3. Adder No. 4. Grampus No. 5. Moccasin No. 6. Pike No. 7. Porpoise No. 8. Shark N	8 8 8 8 8 8	Lewis Nixondo Union Iron Works Lewis Nixon Union Iron Works Lewis Nixondo	85 99 66 98 60 95

ARMOR AND ARMAMENT.

ARMOR AND ARMAMENT.

Your committee recommends under the increase of the Navy an appropriation, as above shown, of \$9,009,600 for armor and armament. The original estimates submitted to the committee called for \$6,000,000 for this object, but an additional estimate was sent in by the Secretary of the Navy, upon recommendation of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, asking that this appropriation might be increased to \$9,000,000 in view of the fact that the armor makers are furnishing armor much faster than was expected; and in this connection it might be said that an item of \$4,000,000 was inserted in the urgent deficiency bill in order to carry out the terms of the contracts. It might also be of interest to quote from the letter forwarded to the committee from the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance:

"1. The Bureau finds that since the estimates were made the monthly expenditures under this appropriation have increased a great deal and now average about \$800,000 per month, which amounts to over \$9,000,000 per year, and to carry it through the remainder of this fiscal year it has been obliged to ask for an urgent deficiency of \$4,000,000 in addition to the \$4,000,000 appropriated in the last naval bill.

"2. This great increase was not anticipated, hor did the experience of the Bureau lead it to expect such. The increase in expenditures is mainly caused by the unusual rapidity of delivery of armor and of miscellaneous ordnance supplies; by the ship contractors urging the delivery of outfits earlier than anticipated, calling for overtime work at the naval gun factory to meet the demands; by the armor manufacturers delivering armor at a much more rapid rate than was thought would be the case when the contracts therefor were placed, and by the payment of obligations incurred during past years." It will be recalled that the Secretary of the Navy, under the authority given him by Congress in the naval appropriation act of two years ago, contracted with the armor-plate companies for the manufacture of \$1,000 tons of arm

plus the Krupp royalty, not to exceed \$4.32 per ton, and the Harvey royalty, not to exceed \$11.20 per ton, which latter royalty is still a matter of dispute between the Department and the Harvey Company.

NAVAL PROGRAMME

The naval appropriation act of last year contained the following provision: "The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to prepare the plans and specifications of two seagoing battle ships and two armored cruisers, carrying the most suitable armor and armament for vessels of their class, and to submit to Congress a general description of such battle ships and cruisers on the first Monday in December next; and the said Secretary in preparing said plans and description shall review and further consider the questions whether said ships shall be sheathed or unsheathed, what should be the weight and extent of the armor therefor, what should be the form and location of the turrets, whether any changes should be made in the number and kind of guns of the various sizes heretofore constituting the armament of similar ships, what, if any, torpedo tubes should be build into large ships, to what extent electricity should be used for auxiliary purposes, and all other questions which have arisen and are now pending among naval architects and ordinance experts concerning the construction of battle ships and cruisers under modern conditions; and said Secretary shall, to such an extent a he may deem expedient, report to Congress in connection with said description his opinion upon the foregoing questions."

In compliance with the above the Secretary of the Navy transmitted to Congress a report prepared by the Board of Construction, in which report the several matters set forth in the above provision are fully discussed and recommendations made with respect thereto, which recommendations were approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

The committee recommend that for the purpose of further increasing the naval establishment of the United States the President is hereby autenticated to have constructed two fir

Type.	Displace- ment.	Cost exclusive of armor and armament.	Armor.	Arma- ment.	Total cost.
Battle ship	Tons. 16,000 14,500 1,000	\$4,211,920 4,659,250 381,840	\$1,800,000 1,175,000 Nothing.	\$1,520,857 880,088 128,908	\$7,532,777 6,714,288 510,748

The complete cost of 2 first-class battle ships, 2 first-class armored cruisers, and 2 gunboats, with total tonnage of 63,000 tons, recommended in this bill, will be approximately \$29,500,000. These battle ships and cruisers will be larger than any heretofore authorized by Congress, and the plans recommended by the board of construction have already excited the favorable comment of the naval authorities abroad. The committee is of the opinion that in recommending the above naval programme it is making a substantial and healthy increase of our Navy, and one which will meet everywhere with popular favor.

PREVIOUS NAVAL PROGRAMMES.

It might be of interest in this connection to give a statement of the ships authorized each year by Congress since the commencement of the new Navy,

Table I.—Ships authorized each year by Congress to be built for the United States Navy since the commencement of the "new navy."

Date of authorization and class.	Ton- nage.	Name.	Num- ber in each class.	Total num- ber for year.	Total ton- nage for year.
Mar. 3, 1883.				24.9	
Protected cruisers	5,000 3,000 3,000 1,486	Chicago	1 0	} 4	12,486
1884 (none). Mar. 3, 1885.	1,486	Dolphin	1		
Protected cruisers Gunboats Aug. 3, 1886.	4,098 3,730 1,710 892	Newark	1 "	} 4	10,430
Monitors	6,060 3,990 3,990 3,990 6,682 6,315	Puritan Monadnock Amphitrite Terror			
Second-class battle ships. Protected cruiser Dynamite gunboat	6,682 6,315 4,413 929	Maine Texas Baltimore Vesuvius	0	9	36,474
Mar. 3, 1887.	105	Cushing			
Monitors	3,990 4,084 4,324 4,098 1,710 1,710	Miantonomoh Monterey Philadelphia San Francisco	2	6	19,916
Sept. 7, 1888.		Concord Bennington		J	
Armored cruiser Protected cruisers	8,200 5,870 3,213 3,213 2,089 2,089	New York Olympia Cincinnati Raleigh		8	27,600
Gunboat	2,089 2,089 2,089 839	Montgomery Detroit Marblehead Bancroft			
Mar. 2, 1889. Gunboats	1,177 1,177 2,155	Machias	} 2	} 8	4,500
June 30, 1890.		Katahdin	1		
Battle ships Protected cruisers	10,288 10,288 10,288 7,375	Indiana Massachusetts Oregon Columbia	} 3	5	38, 35
Mar. 2, 1891.	120	Ericsson	1)	
Protected cruiser July 19, 1892.	7,875	Minneapolis	1	1	7,33
Battle shipArmored cruiser	11,340 9,215	IowaBrooklyn	1	} 2	20,55
Mar. 3, 1893. Gunboats	1,371 1,392	Nashville Wilmington			
Submarine	1,392 120	Helena	3	} 4	4,270
Mar. 2, 1895.	142 142 142	Foote	} 3	. 3	426
Battle shipsGunboats	11,525 11,525 1,000 1,000	Kearsarge Kentucky Annapolis	} 2		
	1,000 1,000	Newport Princeton Wheeling	6	11	29,56
Torpedo boats	1,000 165 165 182	Marietta	} 3		
June 10, 1896.					
Battle ships Torpedo boats	11,525 11,525 11,525 146	Illinois	} 3		05.00
	146 273 65 132 105 464 46	Craven Farragut Mackenzie Fox Morris. Talbot Gwin	10] 13	35, 91

TABLE I	-Shins a	uthorized	each	near	bu	Congress	ete -	Continued	

Date of authorization and class.	Ton- nage.	Name.	Num- ber in each class.	Total num- berfor year.	Total ton- nage for year.
Mar. 3, 1897.					
Torpedo boats	340 247	Stringham Goldsborough Bailey	} 8	1	
Practice vessel (sailing)	235 902	Chesapeake	1	} 4	1,724
May 4, 1898.		THE PARTY			
Battle ships	12,500 12,500	Maine] 3		
Destroyers	420	Bainbridge	{		
	420 420 420 420 408 408 400 400	Barry Chauncey Dale Decatur Hopkins Hull Lawrence McDonough Paul Jones	} 16		
Corpedo boats	420 420 420 433 433 433 167	Perry Preble Stewart Truxton Whipple Worden Bagley		36	59,057
	167 165 165 174 174 166 166 165	Barney Biddle Blakely De Long Nicholson O'Brien Shubrick Stockton Thornton Tingey	12		
Gunboat (not yet built)	165	Tingey)		
Monitors	3,214	gan Arkansas Florida	1		
	3,214 3,214 3,214 3,214	Nevada Wyoming	4	1	
Mar. 3, 1899.					
Battle ships	14,600 15,000 15,000	Virginia Nebraska Georgia	8	1	
Armored cruisers	14,000 14,000 14,000	Pennsylvania West Virginia California	3		
Protected cruisers	3,100	Denver		12	104,600
	3,100 3,100 3,100 3,100 8,100	Des Moines Chattanooga Galveston Tacoma	6		
June 7, 1900.	3,100 3,100	Cleveland)		
Battle ships	15 000	Now Jorsey			
Armored cruisers	14,600	New Jersey Rhode Island Colorado			
	13,600 13,600	Maryland South Dakota	3		
Protected cruisers	13,600 13,600 9,600 9,600 9,600	Milwaukee	} 8	14	99,920
Submarine	9,600 120 120	Charleston			
	120 120 120 120 120	Moccasin Pike Porpoise Shark	6		
1901 (none).	200				

*The Holland (74 tons) was not authorized to be built, but was purchased April 11, 1900.

TABLE II.—Ships authorized each year by Congress to be built for the United States Navy since the commencement of the "new navy."

[Does not include ships of a status other than that of "authorized to be built."]

		1883.		100	1885.	1	1886.
Class or type of ship.	Number.	Total ton- nage.	1884.	Number.	Total ton- nage.	Number.	Total ton- nage.
Battle ships, first or second class Monitors						2 4	12,997 18,000
Cruisers, from 3,000 to 6,000 tons, second class Unprotected cruisers, over 1,000 tons.	3	11,000 1,486		2	7,828	1	4,413
Gunboats Torpedo boats		1,100		2	2,602	1	929 105
Total	4	12,486		4	10,430	9	36, 474

	1	887.		1	.888.		1	1889.		1890.
Class or type of ship.	Number.	Tota ton- nage	1	Number.	Tota ton- nage	1	Number.	Total ton- nage.	Number.	Total ton- nage.
Battle ships, first or second class	2	8,07	4	1	8,20	ō			3	30,86
Cruisers, from 3,000 to 6,000 tons, second class	2	8, 42	2	3	12,29	6				1,011
Cruisers, under 3,000 tons, third class				3	6,26					
1,000 tons	1	1,48	6	1	83		2	2,354 2,155	1	12
Total	6	19,91	6	8	27,60	-	3	4,509	5	38,35
	1	891.	T	1	892.	T	1	893.		1894.
Class or type of ship.	Number.	Tota ton- nage	1 .	Number.	Tota ton- nage	1	Number.	Total ton- nage.	Number.	Total ton- nage.
Battle ships, first or second class. Armored cruisers . Cruisers, over 6,000 tons, first class . Gunboats . Torpedo boats . Submarine	1	7,87	5 -	1	11,34 9,21		3	4,155	3	42
Total	1	7,87	5	2	20,55	5	4	4,270	3	42
	1	895.	Ť	1	896.	T	3	1897.		1898.
Class or type of ship.	Number.	Tota ton- nage	1	Number.	Tota ton- nage	1	Number.	Total ton- nage.	Number.	Total ton- nage.
Battle ships, first or second- class Monitors Gunboats Destroyers Torpedo boats Training vessels and ram	2 6 3	23, 05 6, 00 51	0 -	3	34,57		3	822 902	3 4 1 16 12	37,50 12,85 6,69 2,00
Total	11	29,56	2	13	35, 91	9	4	1,724	36	59,05
		1	1899	1.	1	1900		T		
Class or type of ship.		Number.	to	otal on- age.	F	to	otal on- ge		190	Tota in class
Battle ships, first or second c Armored cruisers. Monitors Cruisers over 6,000 tons, first	class	- 3	44 42	,600	2 3	40,	600 800)		*1
Cruisers from 3,000 to 6,000 second class Cruisers under 3,000 tons, thir Unprotected cruisers over 1,00 Gunboats Destroyers Torpedo boats Submarine Training vessels and ram.	d clas	. 6 s		,000	6					1 1 1 3
Training vessels and ram										

*Ram. b Two of these battle ships were second class, Maine and Texas.

c One gunboat to replace Michigan, never built.
d An eighth submarine, the Holland, was authorized to be purchased. Date of purchase, April 11, 1900.

COST OF SHIPS OF NEW NAVY.

Vessels of the new Navy, built since 1882 and completed to December 31, 1901, number 79, and have cost \$124,899,091.89. Of these, 24 are torpedo boats and 55 are vessels of other classes, as shown in the table below.

The vessels building number 59, and of these 32 are torpedo boats and destroyers, leaving 27 vessels of other classes. The estimated cost of completing these vessels is (June 30, 1900) \$110,183,118. Deducting the appropriations for these vessels—

Fiscal year 1901

\$17,140,699

Fiscal year 1902

29,400,000

Balance on hand in Treasury June 30, 1900

Fiscal year 1902
Balance on hand in Treasury June 30, 1900
Balance to credit of appropriation for submarine torpedo boat
Amounts since deposited or allowed on submarine torpedo boat... 94, 365

shows a balance of \$53,880,013 required to be appropriated to complete the said vessels, outside of any appropriation that may be made or vessels authorized by the present naval bill. Therefore the total number of vessels of the Navy, built and building, is 138, of which 56 are torpedo boats and destroyers, and the total cost will be \$235,082,209.89.

Type.	Built.	Building.	Total.
Battle ships Armored cruisers Protected cruisers Unprotected cruisers Armored ram Monitors Gunboats Training ship Special class Torpedo-boat destroyers Submarine torpedo boats	24	. 4 	18 8 21 3 1 10 16 16 1 2 16 33
Total	77 2	59	136
	79		138

The above table does not include the protected cruisers Albany and New

The above table does not include the protected cruisers Albany and New Orleans, the gunboat Topeka, nor the torpedo boats Manley and Somers, vessels purchased during the Spanish war; neither does it include the submarine torpedo boat Holland, nor captured vessels.

It will be seen from the above table that while we have built and are building, all told, 138 ships, yet comparatively few of them have any real fighting value. Our naval prowess lies almost entirely in our 18 battle ships, 8 armored cruisers, and 21 protected cruisers. The rest of our ships would cut but little figure in actual war. Ships of the battle line practically alone determine the naval strength of a nation.

NAVAL PROGRAMMES OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

Below is a table showing the building programmes for 1901–2, and for 1902–3, of the principal naval powers of the world:

Building programmes for 1901-2, and for 1902-3.

	England.	France.	Germany.	United States.	Russia.	Japan.b	Austria.	Italy.
1901-2. Battle ships. Armored cruisers Other cruisers Gunboats Destroyers Torpedo boats Submarines.	3 6 2 2 10 5 5	10 -11 8	2 1 3 		3 6		3 1	2
1902-3. Battle ships. Armored cruisers Other cruisers Gunboats Destroyers. Torpedo boats Submarines.	2 2 2 2 13 4 4	2 16	2 1 3 1		5		1	3
Ships built and building. Battle ships. Armored cruisers Coast defense and monitors Cruisers Gunboats Destroyers Torpedo boats Submarines	55 26 29 117 68 120 171 5	24 24 14 55 22 43 253 36	29 11 (°) 30 -17 (?) (?)	17 9 10 27 18 16 35 8	19 12 24 32 11 51 197	6 5 7 27 13 11 103	15 3 4 13 14 63	9 10 7 26 14 13 142 1

No ships authorized in 1901-2, 1902-3.
 1902-3, completing programme of 1900. A complete programme is to be considered; no information available, 1902-3.
 Included in battle ships, as in German budget.

Of all the countries, Germany has been building during the last few years faster than any of the others. Her shipbuilding programme started in 1898 and will be completed in 1908, possibly in 1907, instead of 1916, as first planned. Her programme contemplates the following new vessels. Four squadrons each of 8 battle ships, 2 battle ships for flagships, 4 battle ships in reserve. Besides these there are to be 14 large cruisers, 38 smaller cruisers, and 16 divisions of torpedo boats of 6 each. This programme will give her in all 38 battle ships, 14 large cruisers, 38 smaller cruisers, and 96 torpedo boats. After the completion of this programme the plan contemplates new constructions to replace ships which, though still serviceable, may have reached the prescribed age limit.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEW NAVY.

In 1883 we began the construction of our present Navy, and down to 1901, inclusive. \$655,664,000 was appropriated. Of this sum \$590,393,000 has been expended, leaving an unexpended balance of \$65,271,000. The following communication from the Secretary of the Navy, with the accompanying statement, shows the amount of appropriations made each year since the beginning of the construction of the new Navy, and the disposition of the

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, April 2, 1902.

Sin: Replying to your letter of the 17th ultimo, requesting to be furnished with a statement showing the amount of the appropriations made each year since the beginning of the construction of the new Navy; how much of these

appropriations has been used each year, and how much has been covered back into the Treasury; how much of that expended has been used under the different bureaus; how much for the maintenance of the personnel of the Navy, and how much has gone into the public works at navy-yards and naval stations. I have the honor to inclose herewith tabular statements, prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Navy, showing the appropriations, expenditures, and balances pertaining to the naval establishment, by fiscal years from 1823 to 1891, inclusive, as follows:

Statement No. 1. Maintenance of personnel.

Nos. 1 A and 1 B. Pay and subsistence, respectively, as combined in statement No. 1.

No. 2. Appropriations and expenditures under all annual appropriations, by bureaus, for each year separately.

Nos. 2 A and 2 B. Summaries of statement No. 2, by years and bureaus, respectively.

No. 3. Appropriations and expenditures for public works.

No. 4. Increase of the Navy.

No. 5. Special appropriation for specific objects.

Nos. 6, 6 A., and 6 B. War appropriations and expenditures for Marine Corps and miscellaneous appropriations, expenditures, and balances shown in detail by statements from No. 1 to 6 B, inclusive.

The Paymaster-General, in forwarding the above statements, reports as follows:

"In preparing these statements odd dollars and cents have been discarded."

follows:

"In preparing these statements odd dollars and cents have been discarded, but the aggregates are approximately correct. It will be noted from the summary statement, No. 7, that the total of the appropriations for the entire period of mineteen years is \$65.684.000; expenditures, \$59,593,000; balances, \$65,271,000, of which the sum of \$25.850,000 for increase of the Navy and public works remained available for future expenditures on account of these objects, the balance of about \$40,000,000 having been or will be carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury. Adding to the above the total appropriations of about \$22,000,000 for the current fiscal year makes the grand total of appropriations for the twenty years since the beginning of the new Navy approximately \$738,000,000."

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, Secretary,

Hon Gro. Edmund Foss.

Hon. GEO. EDMUND Foss, Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives,

STATEMENT No. 1.

MAINTENANCE OF PERSONNEL.

[This covers pay and subsistence only, the cost of each being shown in Statements Nos. 1 A and 1 B annexed.]

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883	\$8,145,000 8,145,000	\$8,145,000	
1884	7,915,000	8,145,000 7,915,000	
1886	7,990,000	7,930,000 7,900,000	\$60,000
1889	8,245,000 8,340,000	8,140,000 8,330,000	105,000
1890	8,275,000 8,225,000	8,130,000 8,095,000	130,000
892	8,310,000	8,100,000 8,140,000	210,000
895	8,430,000	8,430,000 8,610,000	20,000
896	8,960,000 9,620,000	8,955,000 9,495,000	5,000 125,000
1898	9,485,000	9,400,000	85,000
1899	10,950,000	10,575,000 12,750,000	375,000 3,435,000
901	14,960,000	14,960,000	1
Total	177,010,000	172,145,000	4,865,000

Total cost "Maintenance of personnel" entire period, approximately \$172,145,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT NO. 1 A. PAY OF THE NAVY. Appropriations and expenditures.

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883	\$7,235,000 7,135,000 6,910,000 7,000,000 7,205,000 7,255,000 7,256,000 7,256,000 7,256,000 7,350,000 7,350,000 7,350,000 7,350,000 7,355,000 8,345,000 8,240,000 9,125,000 12,810,000	\$7,235,000 7,135,000 6,910,000 7,000,000 7,210,000 7,140,000 7,145,000 7,155,000 7,380,000 7,555,000 7,555,000 8,310,000 8,160,000 8,160,000 11,300,000 11,300,000	\$5,000 10,000 145,000 125,000 205,000 145,000 **35,000 80,000
Total	153,760,000	150,810,000	2,950,000

*Figures for 1899 given on basis of authorized peace quota. Total pay entire period, \$150,810,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 1-B. SUBSISTENCE.

Appropriations and expenditures under "Provisions, Navy," less amounts expended under this appropriation for labor, included in statement No. 2 ("Supplies and Accounts");

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883	\$810,000 1,010,000 1,005,000 980,000 980,000 980,000 980,000 9875,000 1,010,000 1,030,000 1,075,000 1,075,000 1,275,000	\$910,000 1,019,000 1,005,000 900,000 990,000 990,000 990,000 970,000 1,005,000 1,055,000 1,055,000 1,070,000 1,185,000 1,240,000 1,450,000 1,450,000 2,150,000	\$80,000 100,000 5,000 15,000 20,000 5,000 90,000 5,000 1,235,000
Total	23, 250, 000	21,335,000	1,915,000

Total cost of subsistence entire period, \$21,335,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1903.

STATEMENT No. 2.

Appropriations and expenditures under all annual appropriations (except for "Maintenance of personnel," shown in statement No. 1) for each year and each bureau.

Bureau	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883. Secretary's office. Yards and Docks. Equipment. Navigation. Ordnance. Construction and Repair. Steam Engineering. Supplies and Accounts.	\$456,000 526,000 819,000 329,000 388,000 1,772,000 1,218,000 157,000 138,000	\$450,000 514,000 806,000 329,000 252,000 1,730,000 1,216,000 124,000	\$12,000 13,000 86,000 42,000 2,000 33,000
Medicine and Surgery	5,747,000	127,000 5,554,000	5,000
1884. Secretary's office Yards and Docks. Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery Total 1885. Secretary's office Yards and Docks. Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	402,000 568,000 868,000 901,000 409,000 1,354,000 1,011,000 5,179,000 5,179,000 388,000 424,000 824,000 265,000 212,000 1,023,000 931,000 131,000	402,000 512,000 963,000 287,000 305,000 1,347,000 1,007,000 134,000 123,000	50,000 5,000 14,000 7,000 4,000 2,000 7,000 199,000
Total	4,963,000	4,308,000	55,000
1886. Secretary's office Yards and Docks. Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering. Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	429,000 888,000 322,000 231,000 1,020,000 961,000 146,000 125,000	315,000 227,000 1,019,000 816,000 140,000 106,000	15,000 11,000 99,000 7,000 4,000 1,000 145,000 6,000 19,000
Total	4,518,000	4,211,000	307,000
1887. Secretary's office Yards and Docks Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Account Medicine and Surgery	254,000 440,000 854,000 302,000 211,000 943,000 791,000 175,000	247, 000 430, 000 779, 000 296, 000 940, 000 772, 000 153, 000	7,000 10,000 75,000 6,000 5,000 3,000 19,000 22,000
Total	4,090,000	3,930,000	160,000

 $\label{lem:appropriations} \textit{Appropriations}, \textit{and} \textit{expenditures} \textit{under all annual appropriations}, \textit{etc.} - \texttt{Cont'd}$

Bureau.	Appropri- ated.	Expended.	Balances.
1888. Secretary's office Yards and Docks Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering: Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	\$226,000 749,000 694,000 301,000 233,000 965,000 693,000 232,000 133,000	\$222,000 724,000 640,000 287,000 207,000 963,000 657,000 228,000	\$4,000 25,000 54,000 14,000 26,000 32,000 4,000 5,000
Total	4,226,000	4,026,000	200,000
1889. Secretary's office Yards and Docks. Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering. Supplies and Accounts. Medicine and Surgery.	614,000 808,000 314,000 365,000 845,000	322,000 600,000 800,000 307,000 237,000 838,000 639,000 185,000 128,000	1,000 14,000 8,000 7,000 128,000 7,000 2,000 3,000 1,000
Total	4,218,000	4,047,000	171,000
1890. Yards and Docks. Equipment. Navigation Ordnance. Construction and Repair. Steam Engineering. Supplies and Accounts. Medicine and Surgery.	259,000 525,000 853,000 312,000 264,000 1,070,000 623,000 214,000 123,000	258,000 508,000 776,000 310,000 245,000 1,051,000 620,000 207,000 120,000	1,000 22,000 77,000 2,000 19,000 19,000 3,000 7,000 3,000
Total	4,243,000	4,020,000	153,000
1891. Secretary's office. Yards and Docks. Equipment Navigation Ordnance. Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Accounts. Medicine and Surgery	266,000 628,000 943,000 271,000 254,000 1,020,000 663,000 203,000 126,000	266,000 612,000 961,000 255,000 246,060 1,001,000 642,000 201,000	16,000 12,000 16,000 8,000 19,000 21,000 2,000 6,000
Total	4,374,000	9,274,000	100,000
Secretary's office Yards and Docks Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	277,000 680,000 994,000 273,000 280,000 1,020,000 713,000 202,000 125,000	277,000 669,000 953,000 267,000 273,000 1,012,000 699,000 201,000 125,000	11,000 41,000 6,000 7,000 8,000 14,000 1,000
Total	4,564,000	4,476,000	88,000
1898. Secretary's office. Yards and Docks. Equipment. Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair. Steam Engineering. Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery.	281,000 652,000 956,000 263,000 280,000 970,000 663,000 200,000 122,000	276,000 643,000 943,600 252,000 275,000 956,000 652,000 198,000 122,000	5,000 9,000 13,000 11,000 5,000 14,000 11,000 2,000
Total	4,387,000	4,317,000	70,000
Secretary's office	287,000 651,000 979,000 291,000 326,000 970,000 782,000 211,000 126,000	284,000 641,000 978,000 282,000 380,000 965,000 772,000 209,000 126,000	3,000 10,000 1,000 9,000 6,000 5,000 10,000 2,000
Total	4,623,000	4,577,000	46,000
Secretary's office. Yards and Docks. Equipment Navigation Ordnance. Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery.	339,000 707,000 1,147,000 344,000 325,000 1,078,000 699,000 215,000 126,000	338,000 689,000 1,111,000 326,000 323,000 1,071,000 689,000 210,000 126,000	1,000 18,000 36,000 18,000 2,000 7,000 1,000 5,000
Total	4,971,000	4,883,000	88,000
Secretary's office. Yards and Docks. Equipment	368,000 896,000 1,327,000	363,000 796,000 1,317,000	5,000 10,000 10,000

 $Appropriations \, and \, expenditures \, under \, all \, annual \, appropriations, etc. - Cont'd.$

Bureau.	Appropri- ated.	Expended.	Balances.
1896.			
Navigation	\$339,000	\$334,000 444,000 919,000	\$5,000 6,000 1,000 2,000
Ordnance	\$339,000 450,000	444,000	6,000
Construction and Repair	920,000	919,000	1,000
Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering	696,000	694,000	2,000
Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	213,000	208,000 130,000	5,000
	and department		44.000
Total	5,249,000	5,205,000	44,000
Secretary's office	341,000	340,000	1,000
Yards and Docks	821.000	809,000	12,000
Equipment	1,369,000	1,366,000	3.000
Navigation	377,000	364,000	13,000
Ordnance	598,000	593,000	5,000
Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair	1,369,000 377,000 598,000 2,120,000	1,366,000 364,000 593,000 2,118,000	13,000 5,000 2,000 1,000
Steam Engineering	950,000	949,000	1,000
Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	253,000 148,000	248,000 148,000	5,000
Total	6,977,000	6,935,000	42,000
1898.	3,011,000	9,000,000	22,000
Secretary's office	359,000	350,000	9,000
Yards and Decks	835,000	790,000	9,000 45,000
Equipment	1,609,000	1,605,000	
Navigation	351,000	344,000	7,000
Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering	1,609,000 351,000 846,000 2,120,000	833,000 2,117,000 993,000 276,000	7,000 13,000 3,000 5,000 5,000
Steam Engineering	998,000	998 000	5,000
Supplies and Accounts	281,000	276,000	5,000
Medicine and Surgery	149,000	149,000	
Total	7,548,000	7,457,000	91,000
1899.			
Secretary's office	466,000	461,000	5,000
Yards and Docks	1,123,000	1,102,000 1,947,000	21,000
	1,954,000	1,947,000	- 7,000 31,000
Navigation	574,000		31,000
Construction and Popula	4 000,000	2,000,000	19,000
Navigation Ordnance. Construction and Repair Steam Engineering.	1 353 000	1,566,000 3,973,000 1,351,000 268,000	19,000 50,000 2,000 4,000
Supplies and Accounts	272 000	268,000	4 000
Medicine and Surgery	1,585,000 1,585,000 4,023,000 1,353,000 272,000 157,000	155,000	2,000
Total	11,507,000	11,366,000	141,000
1900.	7.00 (C. 1955)		
Secretary's office.	700,000	675,000	25,000 20,000
Farinment	1,013,000	993,000 2,822,000	20,000
Yards and Docks Equipment Navigation	680,000		15,000
Ordnance	2 248 000	9 992 000	25,000 25,000
Ordnance. Construction and Repair Steam Engineering.	5, 703, 000	5, 703, 000	20,000
Steam Engineering	2,684,000	2,684,000	
Supplies and Accounts	535,000	500,000	35,000
Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	2,887,000 669,000 5,703,000 2,248,000 5,703,000 2,684,000 535,000	2,223,000 5,703,000 2,684,000 500,000 196,000	
Total	16,585,000	16, 430, 000	155,000
1901.	1001-02-11		
Secretary's office Yards and Docks	749,000	749,000	
Yards and Docks	1,110,000	1,110,000	
Equipment Navigation Ordinance Construction and Repair	4,109,000	4,079,009	30,000
Ordnana	1.799 000	1 609 000	200 000
Construction and Repair	7 598 000	7 598 000	30,000
Steam Engineering.	745,000 1,723,000 7,526,000 3,174,000 581,000	8,000,000	75,000
Supplies and Accounts	581,000	571,000	10,000
Medicine and Surgery	205,000	743,000 1,110,000 4,079,009 745,000 1,698,000 -7,526,000 3,099,000 571,000 205,000	10,000
Total	19,022,000	19,777,000	145,000

STATEMENT No. 2 A.
Summary of statement 2, by years, all bureaus.

Year.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
1883 1884 1885 1886 1887 1888 1889 1889 1890 1890 1890 1890 1891 1892 1892 1898 1898	\$5,747,000	\$5,554,000	\$193,000
	5,179,000	4,980,000	199,000
	4,363,000	4,308,000	55,000
	4,518,000	4,211,000	307,000
	4,090,000	3,930,000	160,000
	4,228,000	4,028,000	200,000
	4,218,000	4,047,000	171,000
	4,243,000	4,274,000	153,000
	4,374,000	4,476,000	100,000
	4,564,000	4,577,000	46,000
	4,971,000	4,577,000	88,000
	6,977,000	4,583,000	44,000
	6,977,000	6,935,000	42,000
	7,548,000	6,935,000	91,000
1899	11,507,000	11,366,000	141,000
1900	16,585,000	16,430,000	155,000
1901	19,922,000	19,777,000	145,000
Total	127, 291, 000	124,843,000	2,448,000

Total expenditures under all annual appropriations, entire period (excepting for "Maintenance of personnel," statement No. 1), \$124,843,000.

STATEMENT No. 2 B.

Summary of statement 2, by bureaus, entire period.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Secretary's office Yards and Docks Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Accounts Medicine and Surgery	\$7,147,000 13,301,000 24,832,000 6,943,000 11,208,000 36,462,000 20,226,000 4,545,000 2,627,000	\$7,065,000 12,971,000 24,328,000 6,737,000 10,690,000 36,240,000 19,865,000 4,390,000 2,557,000	\$82,000 330,000 504,000 206,000 518,000 222,000 361,000 155,000 70,000
Total	127,291,000	124,843,000	2,448,000

Total expenditures under all annual appropriations, entire period (excepting for "Maintenance of personnel," statement No. 1), \$124,843,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 3.

PUBLIC WORKS.

In addition to items generally classified under the heading of "Public works," this statement includes special appropriations for the purchase of land and improvements of manufacturing plants at navy-yards for entire period 1883 to 1901.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Yards and Docks Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Medicine and Surgery	\$28,732,000 1,714,000 2,953,000 2,716,000 1,305,000 1,465,000 355,000	\$19,561,000 643,000 2,078,000 2,376,000 1,067,000 915,000 346,000	\$9,171,000 1,071,000 875,000 340,000 238,000 550,000 9,000
Total	39, 240, 000	26,986,000	12, 254, 000

Total expenditures, appropriations for public works, \$26,986,000.

Unexpended balances of appropriations for public works remain available for future expenditures.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 4.

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

This statement covers all appropriations intended for increasing the Navy directly in the line of construction of new vessels and providing for their armor, armament, and equipment, without regard to the titles assigned by the Treasury Department, for entire period 1883 to 1901.

Object.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Hull and machinery Armor and armament Equipment	\$117,414,000 59,435,000 2,840,000	\$106, 194,000 57, 801,000 2, 143,000	\$11,220,000 1,634,000 697,000
Total	179,689,000	166,138,000	13,551,000

Total expenditures, entire period, for increasing the Navy, \$166,138,000. Unexpended balances remain available for future expenditures.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 5.

SPECIAL.

Special appropriations (not for any particular year) under the cognizance of the several bureaus, for specific objects, for which the current annual appro-priations were not applicable, such as indicated below.

Bureau.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Equipment Navigation Ordnance Construction and Repair Steam Engineering Supplies and Accounts	\$237,000 265,000 545,000 983,000 1,113,000 41,000	\$53,000 240,000 317,000 980,000 1,013,000 28,000	\$184,000 25,000 228,000 3,000 100,000 13,000
Total	3,184,000	2,631,000	553,000

Of the above, the expenditures were chiefly as follows:
Equipment: For coaling barges and water boats.
Navigation: For surveys and outfits for apprentices.
Ordnance: For modern batteries for the Hartford and Chicago, and for arming and equipping Naval Militia.
Construction and Repair: For repairs to the Hartford and Chicago.
Steam Engineering: For new machinery for the Chicago and Hartford and new boilers for the Atlanta and Dolphin.
Supplies and Accounts: For consolidating and transportation of naval supplies.
Navy Department.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 6.

War appropriations and expenditures, 1898-99.

11	
Appropriated	\$100,000,000
Expended	70,000,000
Appropriated Expended Balances	30,000,000

Note.—War appropriations are omitted from preceding statements for the reason that to include them would lessen the usefulness of the tables for purposes of comparison.

No. 6 A.

Marine Corps appropriations and expenditures (1883 to 1901, inclusive),

I	Appropriated	\$21,750,000
ı	Expended	20,650,000
I	Appropriated Expended Balances	1,100,000

Note.—The above approximate expenditures of the Marine Corps can not be classified by the Bureau in detail, as disbursements for the Marine Corps have not been made through this office during the entire period mentioned.

No. 6 B.

Miscellaneous appropriations.

Appropriated	\$7,500,000
Appropriated Expended Balances	7,000,000
Balances	500,000

Relief acts, appropriations to cover damages, and for special astronomical observations, expeditions to polar regions, International Naval Review, etc., being directly for naval use, but not assignable to any particular bureau or

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

STATEMENT No. 7.

SUMMARY.

Appropriations, expenditures, and balances for the entire naval establishment from 1883 to 1901, inclusive.

Objects.	Appropriated.	Expended.	Balances.
Increasing the Navy: Statement No. 4. Public works: Statement No. 3. Maintenance of personnel: Statement	\$179,689,000	\$166,138,000	\$13,551,000
	39,240,000	26,986,000	12,254,000
No. 1	177,010,000	172,145,000	4,865,000
Annual purposes: Statement No. 2	127,291,000	124,843,000	2,448,000
Special: Statement No. 5	3,184,000	2,631,000	553,000
War purposes: Statement No. 6	100,000,000	70,000,000	30,000,000
Marine Corps: Statement No. 6 A	21,750,000	20,650,000	1,100,000
Miscellaneous: Statement No. 6 B	7,500,000	7,000,000	500,000
Grand total	655,664,000	590, 393, 000	65,271,000

Total expenditures all naval appropriations for period mentioned,

Total expenditures all naval appropriations for period mentioned, \$59,393,000.

Note.—Practically all of the unexpended balances (\$25,805,000) shown above for "Increasing the Navy" and "Public works" remained available for expenditures after June 30, 1901. The balances under all other headings (about \$40,000,000) have been or will be carried to the surplus fund.

Appropriations (about \$32,000,000) and expenditures for the current year (1902) are not included, as the expenditures are of course incomplete, and can not be even approximated as yet.

Adding the appropriations to the aggregate for previous years will make a grand total, since the beginning of the "New Navy" to date (1883 to 1902) of approximately \$788,000,000.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, April 2, 1902.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Hemenway having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Parkinson, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to resolutions and bills of the following titles:

S. R. 82. Joint resolution providing for the printing annually of franks required for sending out seed;

of franks required for sending out seed;
S. 1295. An act to amend an act authorizing the construction
of a railway, street railway, motor, wagon, and pedestrian bridge
over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha,
Nebr., approved February 13, 1891, and amended by an act approved January 28, 1893, and by an act approved April 21, 1898,
and to authorize the Omaha Bridge and Terminal Railway Company, successor to the Interstate Bridge and Street Railway Company, to complete, reconstruct, and change a bridge for railway and street railway purposes over the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr.;

S. 2951. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria J.

Wilson;
S. C. R. 17. Concurrent resolution to print 10,000 copies of Senate Document No. 84, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the Secretary of Agriculture in relation to the forests, rivers, and mountains of the Southern Appalachian region, etc.;
S. 5736. An act for the relief of citizens of the French West

Indies:

S. 2336. An act granting a pension to Rebecca Coppinger; S. 1305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Arivella D. Meeker; S. 4992. An act to provide an American register for the bark

Homeward Bound; and S. 4506. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Collier.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 13371. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles

D. Palmer; and

H. R. 12054. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burrill. The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3992) granting an increase of pension to David M. McKnight, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. Gallinger, Mr. Deboe, and Mr. Turner as the conferees on the part of the

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 12804. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903. The message also announced that the Senate had passed with-

out amendment the following resolutions:

House concurrent resolution 50.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 25,000 copies of so much of the First Assistant Postmaster-General's Report for 1900-1901 as relates to rural free-delivery service, 10,000 copies for the use of the Post-Office Department, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

House concurrent resolution 49.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 1,000 copies of the Preliminary Description of the Geological and Water Resources of the Southern Half of the Black Hills and Adjoining Regions in South Dakota and Wyoming, recently prepared by Nelson Horatio Darton, under the direction of the United States Geological Survey, 500 copies for use of the House, 250 copies for use of the Secretary of the Interior.

House concurrent resolution 43.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 3,500 additional copies of the annual report of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1901, 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 500 copies for the use of the Senate, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Department of the Interior.

House concurrent resolution 25.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be published and bound 6,000 copies of the State papers and all correspondence bearing upon the purchase of the Territory of Louisiana by the United States, including the treaty of purchase, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives and 2,000 for the use of the Senate.

House concurrent resolution 15.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound, by photolithographic process, with an introduction of not to exceed 25 pages, to be prepared by Dr. Cyrus Adler, librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, for the use of Congress, 9,000 copies of Thomas Jefferson's "Morals of Jesus of Nazareth," as the same appears in the National Museum, 3,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 6,000 copies for the use of the House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5735. An act to fix the compensation of criers and bailiffs in

the United States courts; and

S. R. 98. Joint resolution appropriating the sum of \$500,000. including the \$200,000 already appropriated, for the relief of the French West Indies and St. Vincent.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to my colleague [Mr. RIXEY].

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make a partisan speech, but to submit a few practical observations upon the

As stated by the chairman of the committee, this bill carries something like \$77,000,000—\$442,000 less than was carried in the bill for 1902; but the chairman might have gone further and stated that it carries \$11,000,000 more than was carried in the bill for 1901, and \$24,000,000 more than was carried in the bill for 1900 an excess over 1900 of nearly as much as the whole naval establishment cost ten years ago. This bill carries less than was estimated for by some \$20,000,000, and the Naval Committee deserves credit for the way in which it has brought down these estimates to the amount carried in the bill, and too much credit can not be given to the patience and untiring and painstaking care which the chairman of the committee has given to this subject.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we can never expect to have a naval bill which will carry less than the present bill. naval bill which will carry less than the present bill. This bill would carry more than the bill for 1902 except for two items. There is a reduction of \$7,000,000, as compared with the bill for 1902, for hulls and machinery. There is also a reduction in the bill for 1903, as compared with the bill for 1903, of \$2,500,000 for the Naval Academy at Annapolis. These two items make \$9,500,000. Taking from that the \$442,000 reduction in this bill, and we

have really an increase for the naval establishment proper of some \$9,000,000.

I take it we may never expect to see the naval bill less than it is as present. This bill carries a provision for 500 new cadets at Annapolis. It carries a provision for 3,000 enlisted men, and it is to be followed by a bill to increase the Medical Corps, the Paymaster's Corps, the pharmacists, and I suppose the Marine Corps. I do not mention these matters in a critical spirit, because I realize that when we build ships we have got to provide the men to man them, and we have got to pay the expenses for that purpose. The time to consider these questions is when we are up against the proposition to build ships.

The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs says that it takes a thousand dollars to keep one of these battle ships in commission one day. I think he has greatly underestimated the amount, for Admiral O'Neil states that for the battle ship Alaamount, for Admiral O'Neil states that for the battle ship hadbama the sum of \$70,000 was spent for target practice alone in six months. This is \$449 for every day, Sundays excepted, for target practice, and I take it that the expense for keeping a battle ship in commission can not be less than \$2,000 a day.

I think much of the expense is due to the unfortunate organization of the Navy Department. We have eight separate bureaus in the parallelic the control of the separate bureaus in the parallelic than the separate bureaus.

in the naval establishment, each bureau presided over by an admiral, each bureau, as I understand it, having jurisdiction over the expenditures for that bureau, and almost every bureau having control of millions of dollars. Some of these bureaus interlap, so that it is impossible to tell where the jurisdiction of one stops and another commences. There are rivalries and contentions, so much so that the Secretary of the Navy has been called upon more than once to settle the jurisdiction of the several bureaus. The retiring Secretary of the Navy saw the disadvantage of so

many bureaus, and time and again he earnestly advocated in his annual reports that at least three of these bureaus should be consolidated. No attention was paid to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, except that bills were introduced and referred to the Naval Committee, and there they have slept. In the Secretary's last hearing before the Naval Committee, less than thirty days ago, he was asked his opinion as to consolidating some of these bureaus. The Secretary said he was then about to go out of office and that it was not worth while to refer to the matter. I quote his statement:

I quote his statement:

I have tried every year up to this year, when I have abandoned the attempt simply because I can not carry it through, to consolidate three of our bureaus which I believe could perfectly well be consolidated. I think most of you differ from me in that respect, but it leads to a triple expense. In the yards, where we are either building ships under contract or repairing them at our own yards, the Bureau of Construction and Repair will have an inspector, the Bureau of Steam Engineering will have an inspector, and the Bureau of Equipment will have an inspector. Often in these cases one inspector could superintend all the work. There is a triplication of clerical and other expense which I think might easily be avoided as well as greater efficiency obtained by consolidation.

However, it is not worth while to refer to this matter, because I am overruled by the committee and also resisted by the Bureau officers who do not like to give up their jurisdiction. It is not only the case of the tail wagging the dog, but three tails wagging the dog.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the next matter which I want to call your attention to is on page 35 of the draft of the bill—

Mr. VANDIVER. Before we leave the subject the Secretary has just mentioned, let me ask if the question has been adjudicated as to whether it is passible to consolidate these bureaus I infer from the statement of the honorable Secretary that he is not supported in the proposition, and as I had not heard of the question being settled I ask for information.

Secretary Long. What I am saying is, I think the three bureaus are opposed to consolidation. The Bureau of Construction under its former chief was in favor of it, but not after I made my recommendation to Congress that the head of the consolidated bureau should be either an officer of the line or of the staff.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say I introduced the Department bill which was

the head of the consolidated bureau should be either an officer of the line or of the staff.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say I introduced the Department bill which was sent up in the last Congress, but the question has never been considered by the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; in the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Was there any discussion about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill has never come up for consideration by the committee. It has never been voted upon.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. It was wise, by the expressions made, that it was not voted upon at that time.

Secretary LONG. It is not worth while to go into it now.

It seems to me that the retiring Secretary of the Navy has done all that he could to remedy this crying evil which he says entails unnecessary expense upon the Government, and it does seem to me that the committee of which I am a member might do well to heed the recommendations of the head of the Department and try to consolidate these bureaus for the purpose of saving expense. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the new Secretary of the Navy, young, active, vigorous, and with a reputation to make, may be more successful in his efforts to reform the naval establishment in respect to these different bureaus and place the whole upon a solid business basis.

As an illustration of the reckless way in which some of these bureaus send in their estimates, I will read briefly from the statement of Admiral Endicott of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. He sent in his estimates, which were so grossly excessive that he was notified that he must cut them down and that the committee would only allow what was absolutely necessary.

I will read extracts from only one page of his hearings. Others are almost similar. Starting at the bottom of page 3:

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "blacksmith shop for steam engineer ing, \$42,000."
Admiral Endicorr. That item can be stricken from the bill.
The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "foundry for steam engineering, \$90,-000."

Admiral Endicott. That item can be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "pattern shop for steam engineering, \$56,000."

Admiral Endicort. That item can be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "coppersmith shop for steam engineer."

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "coppersmith shop for steam engineering, \$4,000."

Admiral Endicott. I would let that item go out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "Power house and stack for steam engineering, \$5,000."

Admiral Endicott. I think that item should remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "Steel-plant building for construction and repair (to cost \$240,000), \$100,000."

Admiral Endicott. I have consulted the constructor upon that item, and while it is a thing that ought to be done, it is not necessary at the present time. The constructor feels that if he has to give up anything he would rather give up items at Portsmouth and Boston.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is, "Plate metal workers' shop for construction and repair, \$75,000." That is a new shop?

Admiral Endicott. Yes, sir. I would let that item be stricken from the bill.

And so it goes. Some millions were struck out by the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Naval Committee is entitled to credit for sifting these estimates, but the recklessness with which these bureau officers, or some of them, send in their estimates to the Naval Committee is to be condemned. I insist upon it that the bureaus ought to be remodeled, that some of them ought to be consolidated, and that everything that comes to the Naval Committee ought to come with the sanction and indorsement of the head of the Department.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?
Mr. RIXEY. Certainly.
Mr. DAYTON. Do you mean to say that these estimates do not come to the head of the Navy Department?
Mr. RIXEY. I suppose they do come to the head of the Navy

Department, but-

Mr. DAYTON. Are they not all examined by him and sent by him to the Naval Committee?

Mr. RIXEY. I can only state to you what I suppose would be the case from what I see in the hearings—that he has never examined them. He may have done so; if he has, it does not look very creditable to the head of the Navy Department, in my judgment.

Mr. DAYTON. Is it not very well known to the gentleman that while these estimates were cut down that none of them were for works that were not advisable and desirable in order to build up the naval establishment; and these changes were made, or these cuts were made, because the committee determined first that it would not engage in new constructions at navy-yards, or, at least, very little, and that Admiral Endicott was instructed that anything not thought advisable by him, looking to the future, that it must be cut out. Was not that his reason?

Mr. RIXEY. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but

Admiral Endicott had been informed that the committee would not allow many of the items he sent up, and I think properly so informed; and when millions are cut out, it shows that he was reckless in his statements, as I understand it

Mr. DAYTON. I hope the gentleman will pardon me. I know he does not want to be unfair, and he is not just to Admiral En-

dicott in the statement that he has made. Mr. RIXEY. I will permit the gentleman to ask a question, but when the gentleman proposes to lecture me I shall not permit

You know he represents all the different Mr. DAYTON.

branches of the Navy Department in public works, do you not? Mr. RIXEY. I understand he does. Mr. DAYTON. You know that the reasons for these different

items coming from the different bureaus is because these buildings were desirable and wanted?

Mr. RIXEY. No; I do not know anything of the kind. Mr. DAYTON. You admit you are not a member of the sub-

committee?

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly. I can not yield to my friend for him to make a speech in my time.

Mr. DAYTON. I simply want you to do justice to an honorable man in what you say.

Mr. RIXEY. I have no doubt Admiral Endicott is a first-class

man in his profession; but anyone who will take these estimates must come to the conclusion, in my judgment, that he was reckless in stating what he desired. That there never was any necessity for making these appropriations is shown by the fact that the Naval Committee has cut them down some million dollars. In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here, and I am sorry that the gentleman from West Virginia has left.

Mr. DAYTON. I am here.

Mr. RIXEY. I have a statement here from Admiral Bradford. in which he says, so far as he knows, there is no reason for the very great increase in the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

Mr. DAYTON. I did not hear the statement.
Mr. RIXEY. The statement is this, that Admiral Bradford has stated, and he is the chief of one of the bureaus, that he knows of no reason for the great increase in another one of these bu-

reaus; that is, the Bureau of Construction and Repair.

Mr. DAYTON. Will the gentleman point to that statement?
I have no recollection of it.

Mr. RIXEY. I will read it to you. In the hearings Admiral Bradford said:

The average appropriation, not including "Increase of the Navy" salaries, and public works, for the Bureaus of Equipment, Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Ordnance, from 1890 to 1897, inclusive, was as fol-

Bureau of Equipment	\$1 170 959 90
Bureau of Construction and Repair	1.262.222.50
Bureau of Steam Engineering	849, 032, 52
Bureau of Ordnance	412, 153, 00

Average for the same bureaus from 1898 to 1903, inclusive.

Durent of Ordinatioe 3,300,413,(0)	Bureau of Construction and Repair Bureau of Steam Engineering	\$3,608,752.08 5,784,081.50 3,115,800.00 8,360,415.00
------------------------------------	---	--

Per cent of increase in appropriation for these bureaus for the second period

]	Bureau of Equipment	3 09
13	Bureau of Construction and Repair	4.58
H	Bureau of Steam Engineering	3.67
3	Bureau of Ordnance	8.01

Attention is called to the fact that the average appropriation for the Bureau of Equipment and Bureau of Construction and Repair for the first period was about the same, being a little larger (less than \$160,000) for the Bureau of Construction and Repair. For the second period, however, the average appropriation for the Bureau of Construction and Repair is 60 per cent greater than that for the Bureau of Equipment. So far as I am aware, there is no reason why the same relative expenditures for the two bureaus should not exist to-day as formerly. Attention is called to these expenditures only as an indication of the care that has been exercised by the Bureau of Equipment in the expenditure of money.

Now, it will be seen that Admiral Bradford says that there is

Mr. DAYTON. So far as he knows, and he ought to know, because he is at the head of the Bureau of Equipment.

Mr. DAYTON. But not at the head of the Bureau of Con-

struction and Repair.

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly not; but, as the former Secretary of the Navy suggested, the Bureau of Equipment and the Bureau of Construction and Repair should be consolidated.

Now I will read a little further from Admiral Bradford's statement:

The appropriations, not including "Increase of the Navy," salaries, and public works, for the Bureaus of Equipment, Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Ordnance for the fiscal year 1902 were as follows:

I	Bureau of Equipment	\$3,985,000
١	Bureau of Construction and Repair	7,335,000
I	Bureau of Steam Engineering	3,446,000
	Bureau of Ordnance	9 481 740

Similar estimates of same bureaus for fiscal year toos

4	Demeter communes of same our cans for facts gets 1505.	
1	Bureau of Equipment	\$4,985,000
1	Bureau of Construction and Repair	9,470,000
ı	Bureau of Steam Engineering	4,266,000
1	Bureau of Ordnance	3 403 000

Now, Admiral Bradford states that he knows no reason why the same relative proportion should not exist to-day that existed then, and yet the estimates and appropriations for the Bureau of Construction and Repair are now 100 per cent more than for the Bureau of Equipment.

Under such circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it is no wonder that protests come to this House from conservative sources. I suppose every member of this House has received a protest signed by 135 prominent citizens of Boston protesting against any such great expenditures as were estimated for, but which have been cut down to some extent. The protest is as follows:

Citizens of Boston and vicinity, without reference to party relations, have united in this remonstrance against the proposed vast increase of naval expenditures:

To the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the members of Congress:

To the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the members of Congress:

We regret to learn that the estimates for the Navy for the coming fiscal year aggregate nearly \$100,000,000.

This is about five times the amount expended only ten years ago. The new estimates amount to an average cost of over \$6 for every family in the country. Half this sum applied to education would support 5,000 manual training schools, at nearly \$10,000 apiece, throughout the United States.

We believe that it is a needless extravagance to take for this purpose anything like one hundred millions out of the pockets of the people.

We hold that the maintenance of a vast machinery of war is not only a serious burden upon the people, but a positive menace to the peace of the world.

For more than a hundred years the United States has borne the honorable tradition of a nation which had no read of

For more than a hundred years the United States has borne the honorable tradition of a nation which had no need of great armaments. We urge all who believe in justice, good will, and humanity as the great safeguards of the interests of the nation to exert their influence to maintain this high dis-

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will take but a short time to consider another question which was considered at length by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that is the question of where we are to build the ships authorized in this bill. The chairman of the committee challenged a statement sent out from certain sources that the navy-yards have cost upward of \$100,-000,000. I believe, however, he admitted that they have cost from seventy to eighty million dollars. I understand that the 46 private shipyards of the country have cost about \$68,000,000. Our 10 navy-yards have cost certainly \$70,000,000 and perhaps \$100,000,000. The 46 private yards have cost about \$68,000,000. Now, I want to ask that if these 46 contractors, with their ship-

yards costing on an average a million and a half dollars apiece, can build battle ships, can not our 10 navy-yards, costing on the average of from seven to ten millions, also build them? Tell me they can not build as cheaply as contractors! Why, sir, the plant is already provided; the Government pays no interest upon it; it pays no insurance; the constructors are educated by the Government at Annapolis; it has the very best talent in the country; and you tell me that the Government, with these plants all provided, with the men trained for the purpose, with no interest and no insurance to pay, can not build ships as cheap as contractors who have to provide interest on their plant and insurance and profits! Such a claim is not creditable to the Navy Department nor to any portion of it from its chief down to the laboring man employed by the Department at the navy-yards.

The chairman of the committee, as I understood it, contended

that one reason was that the men in the employ of the Government only worked eight hours, whereas the private shipyards worked their men ten hours. I want to remind him that that reason is likely to be removed; that the Committee on Labor of this House has reported a bill providing that no contractor shall work laborers longer than eight hours upon Government work.

So far as that goes that is likely to be avoided in the future.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a
fact that some of the best ships in the Navy have been built in the Government shippards?

Mr. RIXEY. Four of them, I think, have been built in the Government shippards. The illustration and the comparison which the gentleman from Illinois makes in regard to ships heretofore built in the navy-yards are unfair. When the Maine and the Texas were built the privilege was given to the contractors to take the contract upon the limit fixed by Congress. They declined to take the contract, and the Government was compelled to build these ships at its navy-yards. It had to build them at a time when the navy-yards were not equipped as they are now. It had to build them when it was not prepared properly for the Hence it is unfair to make such a comparison at this time.

But if it were fair, Mr. Chairman, let us see how the prices charged by contractors themselves have varied. In 1890, when only two concerns were competing for construction of ships, it cost to build the *Indiana* \$579 per ton. Five years later, when the Newport News Company was in the field, the Kearsarge was built for \$334 per ton, involving a difference of \$1,673,000 on a single ship.

In 1888 the Columbian Iron Works built the hull and machinery of the *Montgomery* for \$486 per ton. In 1893 the Newport News Company built the hull and machinery of the *Helena* and the Nashville for \$200 per ton-a difference of \$286 per ton as compared with the cost of building the Montgomery. In 1895 the Oregon cost \$610 per ton; but the same contracting parties were Oregon cost \$610 per ton; but the same contracting parties were willing to build the new Maine for \$404 per ton, and the Wisconsin for \$393 per ton. The contract for building the Virginia was given to the Newport News Company at \$478 per ton. The same company built the Kearsarge and the Kentucky at \$317 per ton—a difference of over a million dollars on a single ship.

When you come to compare the cost of building ships you will see that they vary under many conditions. I take it that the cost of building ships in Government yards now can not be estimated by what it cost in 1888

by what it cost in 1888.

Again, in regard to the building of the Maine and the Texas, Constructor Bowles testified that many things which he had to have in the navy-yard were bought by the Government and charged to the Texas. I remember that as to one piece of machinery he was asked where it was charged, and he said it was charged to the *Texas*. He was then asked where that machinery was now, and he answered: "It is still in the navy-yard and doing good work." It is unfair to take the cost of building the *Texas* in 1888 as an indication of what it would cost to build such a vessel at the present time.

A great deal has been said by the gentleman from Illinois in regard to the agitation for this matter having been stirred up by the Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo, Cal. I remind the gentle-man that this agitation for the building of ships in our navy-yards did not originate with that chamber of commerce. I will remind him that two years ago when there was a minority re-

port filed from the Committee on Naval Affairs one of the contentions was that while the Government had these vast and valuable navy-yards it ought to utilize them by building some of its ships in them.

In regard to these cards of the Vallejo Chamber of Commerce which have been sent out, and which the chairman of the committee has so vigorously attacked, I did not expect to say anything about them. So far as I know, they contain a great deal of information and a great many facts. In one of the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs, Mr. O'Connell, who is the head of one of the labor organizations, was asked by one of the members of the committee whether the statements made in these cards were correct. He said "Yes." He was then asked, "How do you know?" And he replied, "Because I have examined the reports at the Navy Department, and I know the statements made in those cards to be true."

Mr. Chairman, that was the time to deny the correctness of those statements; that was the time when Admiral Bowles or anyone else desiring to deny those statements of fact could have sent his denial to the committee, without waiting until this bill was called up for consideration in the House, and then, for the first time, sending here written statements which have been seen by no one but the chairman of the committee, certainly not by the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is admitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] that three years ago Admiral Bowles, who was then constructor, advocated the building of ships in the navy-yards, and he says of course constructors favor the building of ships in navy-yards. It seems to me this is rather an unnecessary reflection upon Admiral Bowles. I might as well say, "Of course, since he has been elevated to the official family of the Secretary. of the Navy and become the head of the Bureau, that he par takes, without reasons for his change of opinion, of the views and opinions of the other chiefs of the bureaus." But, sir, I do not charge that Admiral Bowles has changed his opinion simply because he is elevated to the position at the head of the Bureau, and I insist upon it that his opinion as constructor is as valuable as his present opinion at the head of the Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to his testimony, while he was a constructor and the head of one of the navy-yards, I would refer briefly to his testimony before the Naval Committee since he has been at the head of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, and I state that in that testimony he again recommends the building of ships in the navy-yards. Admiral Bowles was asked by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] if the building of a small vessel in the navy-yards, as a practical test, would not be sufficient. He replied:

I do not think any such test would amount to anything. I think there is a pretty good evidence of the question already. I believe that if this Government finds it necessary and desirable to build ships in the navy-yards as a matter of regular practice that we can do it as economically and as well as it can be done by contract—

Now, this is the opinion of Admiral Bowles since he has been at the Navy Department-

but we must be free from any embarrassment in the way of leaves of absence. As a proof of it I will say it is being regularly done now in the English dockyards. They are building now a little more than they ever have, and they are keeping the cost down lower than the contract price in the private

Now, one reason given by the gentleman from Illinois for the fact, as he stated, that England could build ships in her navyyards cheaper than she could by private contracts, and that we could not do so, was that there the price in the navy-yard was less than it was in the contractor's yard. I do not know as to these facts, but as I understand it the law here is that instead of the price in the navy-yards being from 30 to 40 per cent higher, it requires the price of the navy-yard to be gauged by what it is in the neighborhood. As a matter of fact, the price paid mechanics at Norfolk is less than the price paid at Brooklyn Navy-Yard, and the reason is that the price paid to mechanics outside of the navy-yard in New York is greater than that paid them in Nor-There is no reason why they should be greater. Admiral Bowles again says, in response to a question by Mr. TAYLER:

Could you repair with more economy if you were constructing? Admiral BOWLES. Yes.

In other words, we would gain not only in the building of the vessels, but we would save money in the repairing of them.

When you say that, you mean you would get a larger force and keep them constantly at work?

Admiral BOWLES. Yes.

This testimony is emphatically that it is to the interest of this Government to build at least a portion of our ships in the navyyards. Another witness relied upon to some extent by those who oppose the building of ships in the navy-yards was Admiral O'Neil, who, I believe, a few years ago was opposed to navy-yard construction, but when he was asked by the committee what his opinion now was, he replied, the question being by Mr. Dayton:

There is one other question I would like to ask you. I think you were interrogated a couple of years ago as to the wisdom of building ships in the navy-yards or by private contracts.

Admiral O'NeIL. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. Have you changed your views in regard to that?

Admiral O'NeIL. I don't remember what I said on that occasion. There used to be a provision in the naval appropriation bill that if, when the bids were opened, the Secretary found they could not be advantageously let, he was authorized to build one or more vessels at the navy-yards. That, however, was afterwards taken out of the bill. There is no doubt that the last time they got together on bids.

From this it seems the admiral is of the opinion that the contractors got together, made a combination, that they took the contracts for the battle ships and armored cruisers, costing from six to seven millions each, and divided them among themselves-no competitions in such a case to protect the Government:

The CHAIRMAN. It cost you a good deal to build them in the navy-yards? Admiral O'NEIL. Yes; I think they can build ships now in the navy-yards as cheap as outside, because there is no question of profit; there is no question of interest on the investment, which is a great feature in private work. On the other hand, they have not the money incentive to expedite work, which incentive exists in the case of the private shipbuilder. No navy-yard could do to-day any worse than half of the private shipbuilders on the question of time.

Again the chairman says:

Again the chairman says:

Would we not have to spend a good deal of time to get the navy-yards ready to build ships?

Admiral O'NEIL. No; the New York Navy-Yard can build a ship now. Mr. DAYTON. We have to run the risk of carrying our own insurance? Admiral O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. We have to run the risk of the finished product being a failure instead of a success?

Admiral O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. DAYTON. And we have to be governed by the eight-hour labor law?

Admiral O'NEIL. Yes; but that is getting pretty close to outside concerns now, with the laboring organizations and all that.

Mr. DAYTON. They run ten hours, I think. And on the question of the finished product, you think that the products of the navy-yards would be just as good?

Admiral O'Neil. Yes; I think we would get a better product. It may cost a little more, but it ought not to if the work is carried on conscientiously.

Now, here is the opinion of Admiral O'Neil, who is one of the most experienced chiefs in the Navy Department, stating that the product will be better; that we can do as well or better in the matter of time, and that we can build as cheaply in the navy-yards matter of time, and that we can build as cheaply in the navy-yards as we can outside. I say the preponderance of the evidence in favor of the building Government ships in the navy-yards is overwhelming. In addition to this, we have the testimony of Constructor Stahl, of the Norfork yard; of Constructor Baxter, of the Boston yard, and of the representatives of all the labor organizations in this country, without an exception.

Mr. MAYNARD. Constructor Stahl is stationed at the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, where the Government is building some ships.

Mr. RIXEY. Gentlemen insist that we are not in condition in the navy-yards to build ships. If we are not then it is the

in the navy-yards to build ships. If we are not, then it is the fault of the people who have had charge of these yards. During the past year, as I understand it, we appropriated \$10,000,000 to keep these yards in order. These yards have each cost us an average of from \$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000. Now, I read from an advertisement of one of the contractors, who has the contracts for building two battle ships, the New Jersey and the Rhode Island; one cruiser, the Des Moines, and two torpedo-boat destroyers. Let us see what is the value of his plant. I have his advertisement here. It first quotes from a communication by Benjamin Brooks in the Transcript, made a part of the advertisement:

Brooks in the Transcript, made a part of the advertisement:

If you would behold the American spirit in its purest, strongest, and most buoyant phase, catch it on the wing, so to speak, learn the rate at which things under its inspiring influence can be made to happen, and see how truly robust and promising an infant is a shipbuilding plant, reared under its guidance, at the tender age of twenty-two months, go to Fore River.

At Fore River two things have been going on—the building of ships and the installing of a plant to build them. Logically, the plant should come first, of course, but as a matter of fact the two enterprises have been carried on so side by side and intermingled that the ships, during the confusion, have managed somehow to come out ahead. This is most distinctly an American way of doing things—to start at nothing, to keep moving at all hazard, and decide upon conveniences and methods afterwards.

No even-minded European could ever proceed in such a manner, yet the scheme is a good one, economical, and not without foresight.

This distinctly American spur-of-the-moment way of getting a great plant together is one of the principal reasons for our being so many years ahead of the rest of the mechanical world.

There is at present outstanding \$1,000,000 of preferred stock and \$1,000,000 of common stock issued against a plant which has cost \$1,500,000.

This plant, which is only twenty-two months old, costing a million and a half dollars, located at Fore River, Quincy, Mass. million and a hair dollars, located at Fore River, Quincy, Mass., has contracts from the Government for the building of two battle ships, one cruiser, and two torpedo-boat destroyers. If this plant, twenty-two months old, with its million and a half capital, can build all these great ships at one and the same time, do not tell me that the New York Navy-Yard, with its plant valued at \$20,000,000; the Norfolk Navy-Yard, with a plant valued at \$6,000,000; the

Mare Island Navy-Yard, valued at about the same amount, and the Boston Navy-Yard, valued at about the same amount, can not build them.

I say that if these shipbuilding concerns all over the country can build them and build them upon a profit, surely this Govern-ment, with its navy-yards all paid for and in complete order and kept so for the purpose of repairing ships, surely this Government, I say, can build its own ships in its navy-yards at less cost than can be done outside.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Has this Government ever

built a first-class battle ship at any of its navy-yards?

Mr. RIXEY. It built the Texas at Norfolk and the Maine at Brooklyn.

Mr. MAYNARD. The Texas was a second-class battle ship.

Mr. RIXEY. The *Texas* was a second-class battle ship.
Mr. MAYNARD. They have never tried to build a first-class

battle ship at a Government navy-yard.

Mr. RIXEY. The testimony is overwhelming that they can do Now, I believe there is no difference of opinion as to the ability

of this Government to build its ships. As to the advisability of it there may be some little difference of opinion.

I have read what Admiral Bowles said when he was a constructor. I have read what he stated when he was called before the Naval Committee, giving it as his opinion that we ought to build at least a portion of the ships in the navy-yards; and it was further stated, either by Admiral Bowles or some one else, that England builds the majority of her ships in her navy-yards; that France is building 50 per cent of hers, and that Russia is making an effort to build all of hers in her navy-yards.

When the Secretary of the Navy was heard before the Naval Committee on the 19th of April, just before he went out of office, he gave it as his opinion that ships ought not to be built in the Government navy-yards; and it may be due to the fact of the opposition of the late Secretary of the Navy that the whole Navy Department has for years been opposed to the building of any ships in the Government navy-yards. When he was before the committee, and after Admiral Bowles had already been heard, the Secretary stated that he desired to file certain statements of Admiral Bowles.

In these letters—two to the Secretary of the Navy and two addressed to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Dayron]—Admiral Bowles gives it as his opinion that it will cost 25 per cent more to build vessels in the Government yards than it will to build them in the contractors' yards. Against this belated statement of Admiral Bowles, which comes in without any call on the part of the Navy Committee, and after he has twice testified—against that we place the testimony of every constructor who was called by the Naval Committee. In addition to that, I desire to give the opinion of Admiral Hichborn; and I take it that the House will agree with me that there has never been a better informed head of the Bureau of Construction and Repair than Admiral Hichborn.

In his last annual report to the Secretary of the Navy, which was sent to the House, he strongly advocates building ships in navy-yards. This was just before he left the Bureau. His recommendation is as follows:

ommendation is as follows:

Much has been said both in favor of and against the building of vessels in the navy-yards. The progress made in the improvement of yard plants and the ever-increasing need for a permanent skilled force ready for and capable of at all times taking up repairs of any character which the growth in "matériel" of the Navy entails makes it desirable that the question should be given careful consideration.

There is at the present time, in view of the prosperous condition of the shipbuilding industry and the number of naval vessels building and appropriated for, sufficient work to permit the assignment of a portion of the building work to the Government yards without there being a question of the withdrawal or withholding of necessary support and assistance through work given out to a private industry, the maintenance of which in a high state of efficiency is unquestionably of national importance. These conditions make it possible to eliminate from the discussion any questions of policy except such as affect economy and efficiency.

It has been the history of all the iron and steel navies in existence to-day that the building of the vessels was at first entirely confided to private industry, and that the existence of the nucleus of a steel fleet made it necessary that the governments who were their owners should themselves provide for repairing these vessels: and that, having provided the necessary plant for this purpose, the provision for the maintenance of the equally necessary though vastly more difficult thing to attain, viz, efficient working organization and adequate efficient personnel, forced them to undertake in their navy-yards a portion of the new building work.

Then, he says, England is building in her navy-yards 8 battle

Then, he says, England is building in her navy-yards 8 battle ships and 5 armored cruisers; France is building in her navyyards 3 battle ships and 10 armored cruisers; Germany is building in her navy-yards 3 battle ships and 1 armored cruiser; Russia is building in her navy-yards 3 battle ships and 1 armored cruiser.

He goes on:

In the case of many of the European nations—for example, Denmark and Holland, maintaining smaller navies—so strongly is this necessity for a permanent, efficient navy-yard personnel felt that practically all the naval building work undertaken by them is carried out at their navy-yards.

What they have done and are doing is mentioned here solely to emphasize the fact that the unanimous testimony of experience has been and is that the execution of a certain amount of building work at the chief Government yards is necessary to the maintenance of such navy-yard staffs as a complete and efficient naval organization requires; and that, whatever disadvantages such a course entails, they are more than compensated for in the end. It is believed that we have reached that stage in a naval development—still considerably behind our national development—which forces upon us serious consideration of this step which other naval powers have found necessary and expedient. At the outset the disadvantages to be labored under will be considerable.

Time and experience will do much toward the alleviation or, possibly, the entire removal of many of these. While under existing conditions, in the case of the first vessels built in our navy-yards it may be expected that the cost will not be greatly different from—may even be somewhat greater than for—the same work executed by contract in the private shipyards, the Bureau believes that such a course once entered upon would demonstrate its desirability and practicability in an increased efficiency and economy in naval administration, regarded as a whole, without interference with a judicious policy of such Government encouragement of the shipbuilding industry as will keep the greatest number of establishments in a position to undertake and execute promptly any naval work which may be required.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the time has come to commence

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the time has come to commence building ships in the navy-yards. The contractors are now building for the Government 59 ships. Twenty-seven of these ships will cost \$117,000,000. All of these 59 ships are at present given out to contract, and Admiral O'Neil testifies that they will not be ready for delivery to the Government for two or three years. Why can not we at this time, when the private yards already have 59 of the Government ships, costing probably as much as \$150,000,000, why can not we build the 4 great ships authorized

by this bill in the navy-yards of this country?

The testimony taken by the Naval Committee shows that the navy-yards of this country are running not over one-half of their navy-yards of this country are running not one employ men, capacity; that when a ship comes in for repair they employ men, the chiric finished those men are discharged. They capacity; that when a ship comes in 101 repair and when the ship is finished those men are discharged. They and when the ship is finished those men are discharged. Let us have difficulty in keeping up the force in the navy-yards. Let us give the 4 principal yards in this country the 2 battle ships and 2 armored cruisers authorized in this bill, and let us give them something to do, to give them continuous work, and I take it that not only will the repair work be done in a more satisfactory manner, but I believe these battle ships and armored cruisers will be the pride of this country and equal to anything that the shipbuilding yards have ever constructed. [Loud applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Sherman, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 14046 and had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE RESIGNATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications; which were read:

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., May -, 1902.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I hereby resign my position as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Yours, respectfully,

FRED. H. GILLETT.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., May 9, 1902.

Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

My Dear Sir: I have the honor to hereby resign my position as a member of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

Very respectfully, yours,

MARLIN E. OLMSTED.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., May 8, 1902.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

My Dear Sir: I have the honor hereby to resign my position as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant, ADIN B. CAPRON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these several requests will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following committee assignments:

Foreign Affairs—Mr. Capron, of Rhode Island.
Insular Affairs—Mr. Olmsted, of Pennsylvania.
Naval Affairs—Mr. Lessler, of New York.
Banking and Currency—Mr. Moss, of Kentucky.
Revision of the Laws—Mr. Tirrell, of Massachusetts.

ENROLLED BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. R. 74. Joint resolution relating to publications of the Geological Survey;

S. 5736. An act for the relief of the French West Indies;

- S. 2036. An act granting an increase of pension to Etta Adair
 - S. 182. An act granting a pension to Mary F. Zollinger;
- S. 2336. An act granting a pension to Rebecca Coppinger S. 288. An act granting an increase of pension to De Witt C. Bennett;

S. 500. An act granting a pension to Samuel S. Beaver; S. 1305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Arivella D. Meeker; S. 2632. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting to the Clearwater Valley Railroad Company a right of way through the Nez Perces Indian land in Idaho;"

S. 1593. An act granting an increase of pension to Eben C. Winslow;

S. 2461. An act granting an increase of pension to George McDowell;

S. 2347. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Wheeler;

S. 2755. An act granting a pension to Ruth H. Ferguson;

S. 3279. An act granting a pension to John Coolen; S. 4004. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Nelson;

S. 3331. An act granting a pension to Ada V. Park;

S. 3999. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Hanna:

S. 4238. An act granting an increase of pension to Philo F. Englesby;

S. 4256. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Edens;

S. 4293. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Vincent;

S. 4455. An act granting an increase of pension to Hallowell Goddard; S. 4506. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Col-

S. 4865. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph D.

Hazzard; S. 4979. An act granting an increase of pension to Paul Fuchs; S. 4992. An act to provide an American register for the bark

Otto Geldemeister: S. 5294. An act granting an increase of pension to William F.

Horn; S. 5337. An act granting an increase of pension to Maretta L.

Adams: and S. 4455. An act granting an increase of pension to Hallowell Goddard.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5735. An act to fix the compensation of criers and bailiffs in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary

S. R. 98. Joint resolution appropriating the sum of \$500,000, including the \$200,000 already appropriated, for the relief of the French West Indies and St. Vincent—to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DEEMER, for remainder of the week, on account of important business

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named,

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4777) to authorize the Nashville Terminal Company to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River, in Davidson County, Tenn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2018); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1992) granting the right of way to the Alafia, Manatee and Gulf Coast Railway Company through the United States lighthouse and military reservations on Gasparilla Island, in the State of Florida, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2019); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13725) providing for the selection and retirement of medical officers in the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2020); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3360) for the promotion of First Lieut. Joseph M. Simms, Revenue-Cutter Service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1991); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14221) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. McArthur, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1992); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred to the House (H. R. 11339) granting

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11339) granting a pension to Augustus Blount, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1993); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11453) granting a pension to Catharine Freeman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1994); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11865) granting an increase of pension to John A. Robertson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1995); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions,

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12424) granting an increase of pension to Wallace K. May, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1996); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. B. 12632) granting an increase of pension to Bailey O. Bowden, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1997); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14052) granting an increase of pension to George Fusselman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1998); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensional Committee on Invalid Committee on Invalid

sions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19227) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Emry, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1999); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3768) granting an increase of pension to John W. Campbell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2000); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5205) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Leffingwell, reported the same

an increase of pension to Hiram S. Lemngweit, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2001); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6991) granting an increase of pension to Esek B. Chandler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2002); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8146) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Owens, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2003); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5446) granting a pension to James M. Travis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2004); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9710) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Eagon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2005); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3770) granting a pension to J. E. Dickey, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2006); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8780) granting an increase of pension to Pierson L. Shick, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2007); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12009) granting an increase of pension to George Baker, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2008); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12019) granting an increase of pension to William Lowe. reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2009); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the

bill of the House (H. R. 14987) granting a pension to Lizzie Dunlap, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2010); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14144) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Cross, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2011); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10174) granting

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1014) granting a pension to Jennie M. Harris, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2012); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11250) granting an increase of pension to Arthur L. Currie, removed the same with account of the same with a same way to be a property (No. 11250). ported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2013); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DARRAGH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1797) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Russell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2014); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3888) granting an increase of pension to Jesse H. Hubbard, reported the same

might increase of pension to Jessee R. Rutobard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2015); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5371) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan O. Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2016); which said bill and report types referred to the Private Calendar. said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2921) to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2017); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 14382) to purchase the McLean property and other property at Appomattox, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 14383) to validate certain acts

of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico with reference to the issuance of certain bonds—to the Committee on the Territories

By Mr. SKILES: A bill (H. R. 14384) providing for a life-saving station at the mouth of Black River, at or near the city of Lorain, Lorain County, in the State of Ohio, and for life-saving crew, and so forth—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 14385) to extend to the city of Paducah the operation of an act entitled "An act to amend an act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement"-to the Committee on Ways and Means. By Mr. McCLEARY: A bill (H. R. 14386) to establish a fish-

hatching and fish station in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 14387) to provide for the opening and closing of alleys and the opening of minor streets in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 14388) granting an increase of pension to Graham McClosson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 14389) for the relief of the heirs of Joel S. Calvert—to the Committee on War Claims.
Also, a bill (H. R. 14390) granting an increase of pension to
George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 14391) granting an increase of

pension to Edward Walsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 14392) for the relief of the estate of Ramsay Crooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14393) for the relief of Ramsay Crooks—

the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 14394) granting pensions to Mahala J. Binckley and Minnie A. Binckley—to the Committee

to Mahala J. Binckley and Minnie A. Binckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14395) granting a pension to William Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14396) granting a pension to Robert Lappin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14397) granting an increase of pension to George Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 14398) granting an increase of pension to David M. Shopstaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 14399) granting an increase of pension to William L. Gerard—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 14400) granting an increase of pension to Edward Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 14401) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Leaman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14402) granting an increase of pension to Alfred W. Morley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 14403) granting a pension to John A. Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 14404) for the relief of Theodom Mr. Pugsley:

dore Teed, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14405) for the relief of Henry Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14406) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Eiseley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SKILES: A bill (H. R. 14407) granting a pension to

May Jennings Bunn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 14408) granting a pension to Benjamin McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14409) to remove the charge of desertion from William A. Emerson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of Buffalo (N. Y.) Merchants' Exchange, approving the reorganization of the consular service to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEIDLER: Resolutions of United Trades and Labor Council of Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, urging the use of local sandstone in the construction of new Federal building at Cleveland, Ohio-to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolutions of Columbus, Ohio, Credit Men's Association in regard to the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the

Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Resolution of Port Arthur Laborers' Building Association, for more rigid restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CREAMER: Resolutions of Bricklayers' General Executive Board of Greater New York, favoring the passage of House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of Engineers' Society of West-

ern Pennsylvania, in favor of the metric system—to the Commit-tee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. By Mr. HANBURY: Resolutions of Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., and the Republican Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12283, for the relief of Christian Besserer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Seventh assembly district and Sixteenth assembly district Republican clubs of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Women's Republican Association of New York, and Storekeepers' Union No. 1, of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Seventh assembly district Republican Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 7930, to regulate the hours of labor of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolutions of United Mine Workers'

Unions of Princeton and Evansville, Ind., favoring the restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from the south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of German Liquor Dealers' Association, of Trenton, N. J., in favor of House bills 178 and 179, reducing the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways

and Means.

By Mr. KERN: Resolutions of Zealous Lodge, No. 217, Locomotive Firemen, of East St. Louis, Ill., favoring the irrigation bill as amended by the Senate—to the Committee on Irrigation of

Also, resolutions of John D. Miley Camp, No. 20, Service Men in the Spanish War, of Belleville, Ill., favoring the Bell bill, allowing travel pay to volunteers from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Union No. 750, of

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Union No. 750, of Lynn Station, Ill., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Iron Trade Council of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of C. W. Hanscom and other citizens of Bath, Me., for repeal of the duties on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG: Protest of M. A. Webb and other citizens of Lyons, Kans., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Newton, Kans., against the con-

Also, petition of citizens of Newton, Kans., against the construction of a Pacific cable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Petitions of Singers' Society of the Holy Trinity and Casimir Jagiellonczyk Society, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count

Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MORRIS: Petitions of Post No. 40, of Sauk Center;
Post No. 128, of Duluth; Post No. 2, of Anoka; Post No. 30, of
Brainerd; Post No. 147, of Park Rapids; Post No. 52, of Monticello; Post No. 134, of St. Cloud, and Stanard Post, No. 161, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring
House bill 3067, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Polish National Alliance Society, of Duluth, Minn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the

Library.

Also, resolutions of Itasca Lodge, No. 401, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Two Harbors, Minn., and Tailors' Union No. 97, of Duluth, Minn., favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and NaturalizaBy Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of numerous voters of Steelton, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 1890, the per diem pension

bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of General E. O. C. Ord Circle, No. 20, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Harrisburg, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Petition of R. W. Shaw, of Cherokee County, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of the National Association of Retail Druggists, urging the immediate reduction of the internalrevenue tax on alcohol to 70 cents a gallon-to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Petitions of 1,800 citizens of Newcastle, 300 citizens of Euclid and West Liberty, and numerous churches in Lawrence County, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. SKILES: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to May E. Bunn, widow of Maj. George B. Bunn, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of A. W. James and others, of Morrow County,

Ohio, for the passage of a service pension bill-to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Musicians' Mutual Benefit Association No. 41, of New York City, in favor of the proposed increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Daniel E. Ryan and other citizens of New York City, for the repeal of the tariff on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: Petitions of numerous citizens of Fayette County, Ky., and vicinity, in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits-to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 14, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. ELKINS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT protempore. The Journal, without objection,

will stand approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of New River Division, No. 140, Order of Railway Conductors, of Hinton, W. Va., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the granting of pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service of the United States, etc.; which was referred to the Committee

on Pensions.

on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 403, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Tacoma; of Mount Tacoma Division, No. 249, Order of Railway Conductors, of Tacoma, and of Puget Sound Lodge, No. 196, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Seattle, all in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefore which were ordered to lie on the sage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Merchants Exchange of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service; which was ordered to

lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 167, Order of Railway Conductors, of Oswego, N. Y.. praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the

He also presented a petition of the Iron Trades Council of San

Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petition of C. Hoffman & Son, of Enterprise, Kans., and a petition of the Kelley Milling Company, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the adoption of certain reciprocity treaties; which were referred to the Committee on For-

eign Relations.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Local Division No. 370, Order of Railway Conductors, of Providence, R. I., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of J. C. Nichols Post, No. 19, Department of Rhode Island, Grand Army of the Republic, of Rock-land, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over and increasing the pensions of widows of soldiers to \$12 per month; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Local Union No. 114, American Federation of Labor, of Providence, R. I., remonstrating against the adoption of certain amendments to the copyright law; which was referred to the

Committee on Patents.

Mr. WELLINGTON presented a petition of Patapsco Lodge, No. 432, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of the Central Labor Council of Astoria, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legisla-tion providing an educational test for immigrants to this coun-

try; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of G. B. Baird, of
Shelbyville, Ind., and the petition of D. W. Edwards, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the improvement of the post exchanges; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Charles F. Holler, of South Bend, Ind., and the petition of J. C. Martin, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in immigrant stations; which were

referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Sterling Remedy Company, of Kramer, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to section 4 of the act of June 13, 1898, making appropriation for the postal service, relative to second, third, and fourth class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Dr. Moses H. Waters and sundry other physicians, of James P. Stunkard and sundry other at-torneys, of Barker & Walsh and sundry other liquor dealers, of E. H. Bindley & Co. and sundry other wholesale druggists, and of C. W. West & Co. and sundry other retail druggists, all of Terre Haute, in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the internal-revenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which were referred to the Committee on Finance

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of Still River Lodge, No. 493, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Danbury, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Grand Division, Sons of Temperance, of Connecticut, praying for an increase of the allowance for rations to the soldiers in the Army; which was referred to

the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, Fairfield, and Stratford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the appointment of a commission to inquire into the condition of the colored people of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Lincoln Division No. 206, Order of Railway Conductors, of Springfield, Ill., and a petition of Local Division No. 386, Order of Railway Conductors, of East St. Louis, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy"